Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 89-298
S. 2300

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 2300 1
Digest of Public Law 89-298 2

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 89-298
S. 2300

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 2300

July 19, 1965	Senate Public Works Committee reported an original bill, S. 2300. S. Report No. 464. Print of bill and report.
July 27, 1965	Senate passed S. 2300 with amendments.
July 28, 1965	S. 2300 was referred to House Public Works Committee. Print of bill as referred.
Sept. 1, 1965	House committee voted to report S. 2300.
Sept. 9, 1965	House committee reported S. 2300 with amendment. H. Report No. 973. Print of bill and report.
Sept. 16, 1965	House Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of S. 2300. H. Res. 588, H. Report No. 1021. Print of resolution and report.
Sept. 21, 1965	House began debate on S. 2300.
Sept. 22, 1965	House passed S. 2300 with amendments.
Sept. 23, 1965	Senate conferees were appointed on S. 2300.
Sept. 24, 1965	House conferees were appointed on S. 2300.
Oct. 18, 1965	House received conference report on S. 2300. H. Report No. 1170. Print of report.
Oct. 19, 1965	Senate agreed to conference report on S. 2300.
Oct. 20, 1965	House agreed to conference report on S. 2300.
Oct. 27, 1965	Approved: Public Law 89-298.

Hearings: H. committee: "Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Bills, 1965", parts 1, 2 and 3.

S. committee: "Public Works Authorizations, 1965", parts 1 thru 4.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 2300

July 19, 1965 Senate Public Works Committee reported an original bill, S. 2300. S. Report No. 1060. Print of bill and report.

July 27, 1965 Senate passed S. 2300 with amendments.

July 28, 1965 S. 2300 was referred to House Public Works Committee. Print of bill as referred.

Sept. 1, 1965 House committee voted to report S. 2300.

Sept. 9, 1965 House committee reported S. 2300 with amendment. H. Report No. 973. Print of bill and report.

Sept. 10, 1965 House Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of S. 2300. H. Res. 588, H. Report No. 1021. Print of resolution and report

Sept. 21, 1965 House began debate on S. 2300.

Sept. 22, 1965 House passed S. 2300 with amendments.

Sept. 23, 1965 Senate conferees were appointed on S. 2300.

Sept. 24, 1965 House conferees were appointed on S. 2300.

Oct. 18, 1965 House received conference report on S. 2300. H. Report No. 1170. Print of report.

Oct. 19, 1965 Senate agreed to conference report on S. 2300.

Oct. 20, 1965 House agreed to conference report on S. 2300.

Oct. 27, 1965 Approved: Public Law 89-298.

Hearings: H. committee: "Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Bills, 1965", parts 1, 2 and 3.

S. committee: "Public Works Authorizations, 1965", parts 1 thru 4.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 89-298

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACTS OF 1965. Provides authorizations for the Corps of Engineers for various rivers and harbors and flood control projects. Authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States. Such plans may provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Corps of Engineers of a system of major reservoirs to be located within river basins of the northeastern States, major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between river basins, and major purification facilities.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 89-298

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACTS OF 1965.
Provides authorizations for the Corps of Engineers for various rivers and harbors and flood control projects. Authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States. Such plans may provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Corps of Engineers of a system of major reservoirs to be located within river basins of the northeastern States, major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between river basins, and major purification facilities.

Digest of Congressional Proceedings

INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

CONTENTS

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 20, 1965
For actions of July 19, 1965
89th-1st; No. 130

CONTENTS

Appropriations.12,16,35,39
Bread tax.....25
Claims.....14
Commodity exchanges.....22
Conservation.....7
Corn.....21
Cotton.....8
Disaster relief...11,32,38
Education.....30,36
Farm labor.....20,26
Farm program.....23,28,40
Feed grains.....40
Flood control.....10,18
Food.....29
Foreign aid.....29
Foreign trade.....33
Forestry.....1
Health.....6
Highways.....15
Housing.....9
Lands.....1
Legislative program.....24
Loans.....2,3,9
Military construction...39
Poverty.....24,27
Public Law 480.....21
Public works.....10,37
Reclamation.....4
Research.....5,13,19
Saline water.....13
Surplus property.....34
Trade expansion.....33
User charges.....7
Veterans benefits.....2
Watersheds.....17,31
Wheat.....25,40

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Harris criticized fees established under Land and Water Conservation Fund. Sen. Kuchel urged increased production of "quality" cotton to compete with synthetics. Rep. Ashbrook criticized alleged "partisan policies" to promote passage of farm bill. Rep. Purcell urged passage of farm bill.

SENATE

1. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 1764, to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Unita National Forest, Utah (S. Rept. 467). p. 16743

2. VETERANS' BENEFITS. By a vote of 69 to 17, passed as reported S. 9, to give cold war veterans educational and home-loan benefits similar to those of World War II and Korean conflict veterans, including institutional on-farm training and home and farm loan assistance by the Veterans Administration. pp. 16672-4, 16676-7, 16679-82, 16684-724

3. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 625, with amendment, to authorize the sale of certain or disconnected tracts of land, and S. 1190, to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to Alaska for the use of the University of Alaska. p. D665

4. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 34, with amendment, to make certain provisions in connection with construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project. p. D665

5. RESEARCH. Passed as reported S. 949, to authorize a 5-year program of matching grants to the States by the Commerce Department in a cooperative effort to promote the wider diffusion and more effective application of the findings of science and technology throughout commerce and industry. pp. 16728-32

6. HEALTH. Conferees were appointed on S. 510, to extend and amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services (p. 16672). House conferees have already been appointed.

7. USER CHARGES; CONSERVATION. Sen. Harris criticized user charges established under the Land and Water Conservation Fund, urged enactment of legislation to give Congress veto power over any fees established by Federal agencies, and inserted an Okla. Legislature resolution in support of his position. p. 16645

8. COTTON. Sen. Kuchel urged increased production of "quality" cotton to compete more effectively with synthetics, expressed opposition to payment of price supports "on cotton that is not of sufficiently high quality to be used in our high-speed and efficient modern textile mills," and inserted a letter from the president of the Western Cotton Growers Assoc. in support of his position. p. 16657

9. HOUSING LOANS. Conferees were appointed by both Houses on H. R. 7984, the housing and urban development bill. pp. 16555, 16700
   Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserted an article by Vice President Humphrey reviewing and commending the housing and urban development bill. pp. 16660-1

10. PUBLIC WORKS; FLOOD CONTROL. The Public Works Committee reported an original bill, S. 2300, to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and other purposes (S. Rept. 464). p. 16646

11. DISASTER RELIEF. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Inouye, S. 1861, to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. p. 16644

HOUSE

12. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966. Conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 8775, which includes items for the Government Printing Office and the Library of Congress (pp. 16553-5). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

13. SALINE-WATER; RESEARCH. Conferees were appointed on S. 24, to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by Interior (p. 16555). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

Calendar No. 448

89TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
No. 464

PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATIONS, 1965, RIVERS AND HARBORS—FLOOD CONTROL AND MULTIPLE-PURPOSE PROJECTS

JULY 19, 1965.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MCNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2300]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize construction of certain navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, multiple purpose, and related projects, on which favorable recommendations have been made by the Chief of Engineers; to extend the authorized comprehensive program for control of obnoxious aquatic plant growths from navigable waters; to grant the consent of Congress to the State of Pennsylvania for construction of a dam on the Susquehanna River; to provide for loans to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation in economically depressed areas; to approve certain procedures for prosecution of the work in the Scioto River Basin, Ohio; to authorize a comprehensive survey of the southeast Michigan area; to authorize surveys of problems on streams in other localities, to be carried out by the Corps of Engineers; to provide for reimbursement to local interests for work done on authorized beach erosion control projects. All the works of improvement authorized in this bill are to be prosecuted in accordance with existing law and stipulations contained in the appropriate project documents as modified by certain comments and remarks contained herein.

50-894—65——1

Hearings

The Committee on Public Works held hearings for a total of 17 days on projects and reports that had been favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers, on proposed legislation that had been referred to it, and on proposals for development of the water resources of the Nation. The hearings were initiated in March and extended through June. During the course of the hearings, testimony was received from the Corps of Engineers, Members of Congress, Federal and State officials, representatives of local organizations, and from citizens interested in specific projects and proposals. The members of the committee devoted many long hours in the conduct of these hearings and in the consideration of the material thus presented.

Need for Bill

Over the years, the Congress has evolved a body of legislation establishing the Federal interest in civil works projects for many purposes. As a result of a number of authorizing acts, a considerable Federal program of such projects has been developed. However, many other problems and meritorious projects still await study and consideration. Continuing study and revision of the program in keeping with current and prospective needs are essential to sound regional and national development and to efficient use of the Nation's financial and natural resources. The projects contained in this bill are the results of such study. The bill is necessary to provide authorization for their undertaking, and for effective continuing undertaking of certain comprehensive river basin plans and programs previously authorized by the Congress.

General Statement

The last general authorization bill was the act of October 23, 1962. It has been the policy of the Congress to consider authorization bills of this nature at intervals of from 2 to 4 years. Since the last authorization bill, many favorable reports on proposed projects have been transmitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers. There are also several matters of general legislation which should be considered at this time.

The survey program forms the basis for the entire civil works program and should be kept current and abreast of the present needs of various areas and localities of our country. The bill includes authorization for additional surveys of flood control and navigation projects.

The projects recommended for authorization by the committee will prove to be a valuable addition to the existing Federal water resource program. The projects have been conceived and recommended by the Corps of Engineers to prevent or reduce the damages caused by rampaging flood waters; to provide water for municipal, agricultural, and industrial use; to generate hydroelectric power for our cities and farms; to provide recreational facilities; and to develop and improve the Nation's navigation facilities. Their early authorization will benefit the entire country.

The Federal civil works program under jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, embraces the works for improving rivers, lakes, coastal areas, and harbors of the United States in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power development, water supply, pollution abatement, recreation, beach erosion control, and other allied water purposes. Much of this work has been carried on for over 140 years since the first appropriation by Congress in 1824. In the river and harbor and flood control legislation since that time Congress has delineated the policies, prescribed the procedures and authorized the water resources developments which constitute the present civil works program, and has delegated to the Corps of Engineers the duty of planning, providing, and administering the works involved therein.

Water transportation plays an important and useful part in the national economy. The Federal river and harbor program has produced the best system of navigable harbors and waterways possessed by any nation. Since Congress initiated the program in 1824, considerable sums of money have been appropriated for improving and maintaining the navigable waterways of the Nation. The resulting improved waterways carry a huge tonnage of foreign and interstate commerce, have made possible free, easy, and unobstructed interstate commerce, and have more than justified their provision.

Flood control as a Federal activity is of comparatively recent origin. Large-scale and effective Federal flood control operations in the Mississippi Valley date from 1928, and nationwide Federal operations began in 1936 with the enactment of the first general flood control act.

The present Federal flood control program includes over 800 flood prevention projects that are in operation, having been previously authorized by the Congress. These projects are located in nearly every State of the Union. The projects are chiefly multiple-use developments which are components of comprehensive river development plans for the conservation, control, and beneficial use of water in the best balanced interest of all elements involved.

Monetary Summary of Bill

The following table summarizes the number of projects contained in the bill, together with the total estimated Federal cost:

	Number	Amount
Title I:		
Navigation projects	37	$232,926,000
Beach erosion control projects	8	4,415,400
Total, title I	45	237,341,400
Title II:		
Flood control and multiple-purpose projects	64	1,731,144,100
Grand total	109	1,968,485,500

List of Projects by States

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Alabama:	
Navigation:	
Bayou La Batre	$262, 000
Perdido Pass	625, 000
Total	887, 000
Flood control	None
Total, Alabama	887, 000
Alaska	None
Arizona:	
Flood control:	
Indian Bend Wash	7, 250, 000
Phoenix	58, 310, 000
Winslow	2, 775, 000
Total, Arizona	68, 335, 000
Arkansas. (See Mississippi.)	
California:	
Navigation:	
Bodega Bay	853, 000
Oceanside Harbor	Maintenance
Port San Luis	6, 360, 000
San Francisco Bay to Stockton	46, 853, 000
Total	54, 066, 000
Flood control:	
Eel River	13, 732, 000
Napa River	14, 950, 000
San Diego River	14, 600, 000
Santa Rosa Wash	6, 430, p00
Sonoma Creek	9, 400, 000
Tahquitz Creek	3, 030, 000
Yuba River, Bullards Bar	8, 979, p00
Total	71, 121. 000
Total, California	125, 187, 000
Colorado:	
Flood control: Arkansas River at Las Animas	1, 541, 000
Connecticut:	
Flood control:	
Housatonic River	5, 100, 000
Stratford	4, 340, 000
Total, Connecticut	9, 440, 000
Delaware	None
Florida:	
Navigation:	
Broward County	1, 093, 000
East Pass Channel	1, 151, 000
Fort Pierce	220, 000
Jacksonville Harbor	8, 484, 000
Ponce de Leon Inlet	1, 104, 000
Total	12, 052, 000

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Florida—Continued	
Flood control:	
Biscayne Bay	$1,954,000
Hendry County	4,986,000
Phillippi Creek	4,592,000
Southwest Dade County	4,903,000
Total	16,435,000
Total, Florida	28,487,000
Georgia:	
Navigation: Savannah Harbor	7,112,000
Flood control: Flint River	88,653,000
Total, Georgia	95,765,000
Hawaii:	
Navigation:	
Coasts of Hawaiian Islands	4,737,000
Haleiwa Beach	572,400
Honokahau Harbor	680,000
Honolulu Harbor-Barbers Point Harbor	9,928,000
Kawaihae Harbor	2,291,000
Waikiki Beach	2,490,000
Total	20,698,400
Flood control	None
Total, Hawaii	20,698,400
Idaho	None
Illinois:	
Navigation: Evanston	392,000
Flood control:	
East St. Louis	6,180,000
Kaskaskia River levees	3,498,000
Wabash River. (See Indiana.)	
Wood River Drainage and Levee District	179,000
Total	9,857,000
Total, Illinois	10,249,000
Indiana:	
Navigation:	
Indiana Harbor	96,000
Burns Waterway	25,000,000
Total	25,096,000
Flood control:	
Wabash River Interim Report No. 1	44,800,000
Wabash River Interim Report No. 2	72,900,000
Total	117,700,000
Total, Indiana	142,796,000
Iowa:	
Flood control:	
Iowa and Cedar Rivers	17,570,000
Big Sioux River	6,400,000
Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers, Iowa and Mo. (See Missouri.)	
Grand River, Iowa and Mo. (See Missouri.)	
Total, Iowa	23,970,000

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Kansas:	
Flood control:	
Big Creek at Hays	$2, 702, 000
John Redmond Dam	730, 000
Walnut River	66, 036, 000
Arkansas River at Great Bend	4, 030, 000
Total, Kansas	73, 498, 000
Kentucky:	
Flood control:	
Big South Fork-Devils Jumps Dam (see also Tennessee)	151, 000, 000
Martins Fork Reservoir	4, 860, 000
Big Sandy River	51, 491, 000
Total, Kentucky	207, 351, 000
Louisiana:	
Navigation: Mementau River	2, 690, 000
Flood control:	
Bayou Bodcau	1, 524, 000
Caddo Dam	1, 934, 000
Grand Isle and vicinity	5, 500, 000
Lake Pontchartrain	56, 922, 000
Morgan City and vicinity	3, 049, 000
Ouachita River at Monroe	520, 000
Total	69, 449, 000
Total, Louisiana	72, 139, 000
Maine:	
Flood control: St. John River	227, 000, 000
Maryland:	
Navigation: Tred Avon River, Talbot County	323, 000
Massachusetts:	
Navigation: Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor	12, 500, 000
Michigan:	
Navigation:	
Alpena Harbor	806, 000
Frankfort Harbor	237, 000
Lexington Harbor	563, 000
Saginaw Harbor	437, 000
Total	2, 043, 000
Flood control: Grand River at Grandville	1, 373, 000
Total, Michigan	3, 416, 000
Minnesota:	
Flood control:	
Big Stone Lake (see also South Dakota)	3, 885, 000
Zumbro River	975, 000
Total, Minnesota	4, 860, 000
Mississippi: Mississippi River and tributaries (see also Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee)	181, 109, 100
Missouri:	
Flood control:	
Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers	9, 167, 000
Grand River	278, 635, 000
Mississippi River and tributaries. (See Mississippi.)	
Total, Missouri	287, 802, 000
Montana	None

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Nebraska:	
Flood control: Little Nemaha River	$1, 524, 000
Nevada	None
New Hampshire	None
New Jersey:	
Navigation:	
Atlantic City	Periodic nourishment
New York-New Jersey channels. (See New York.)	
New York Harbor anchorages. (See New York.)	
Perth Amboy	82, 000
Total	82, 000
Flood control: Rahway River	1, 514, 000
Total, New Jersey	1, 596, 000
New Mexico	None
New York:	
Navigation:	
New York-New Jersey channels	2, 581, 000
New York Harbor anchorages	44, 852, 000
Total	47, 433, 000
Flood control:	
East Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay	32, 620, 000
Staten Island	6, 230, 000
Total	38, 850, 000
Total, New York	86, 283, 000
North Carolina:	
Flood Control:	
Neuse River	18, 600, 000
New Bern	10, 400, 000
Ocracoke Island	1, 636, 000
Total, North Carolina	30, 636, 000
North Dakota	None
Ohio:	
Navigation:	
Rocky River Harbor	235, 000
West Harbor	544, 000
Total	779, 000
Flood control:	
Chagrin River	2, 200, 000
Maumee River at Findlay	9, 317, 000
Total	11, 517, 000
Total, Ohio	12, 296, 000
Oklahoma:	
Flood control: Shidler Dam and Reservoir	6, 150, 000
Oregon:	
Navigation:	
Chetco River	1, 308, 000
Port Orford	696, 000
John Day lock and dam	676, 000
Total	2, 680, 000
Flood control: Willow Creek	6, 680, 000
Total, Oregon	9, 360, 000

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Pennsylvania:	
Flood control:	
Chartiers Creek	$12, 207, 000
Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois	1, 654, 000
Total, Pennsylvania	13, 861, 000
Rhode Island:	
Navigation:	
Cliff Walk	340, 000
Providence River and Harbor	13, 900, 000
Total	14, 240, 000
Flood control: Westerly	3, 287, 000
Total, Rhode Island	17, 572, 000
South Carolina:	
Navigation: Hunting Island Beach	319, 000
South Dakota:	
Flood control:	
Big Stone Lake. (See Minnesota.)	
Big Sioux River. (See Iowa.)	
Tennessee:	
Flood control:	
Big South Fork-Devils Jumps Dam. (See Kentucky.)	
Mississippi River and tributaries. (See Mississippi.)	
Texas:	
Navigation: Chocolate Bayou	1, 254, 000
Flood control:	
Buffalo River	1, 800, 000
El Paso, El Paso County	12, 493, 000
Highland Bayou	3, 500, 000
Taylors Bayou	6, 290, 000
Total	24, 083, 000
Total, Texas	25, 337, 000
Utah	None
Vermont	None
Virginia:	
Navigation:	
Hampton Creek	Maintenance
Newport News Channel	7, 095, 000
Newport News-Norfolk Harbor	25, 600, 000
Total, Virginia	32, 695, 000
Washington:	
Navigation:	
John Day lock and dam. (See Oregon.)	
Edmonds Harbor	Maintenance
West Virginia:	
Flood control:	
Cheat River	133, 548, 000
Big Sandy. (See Kentucky.)	
Wisconsin	None
Wyoming	None
Puerto Rico	None
Grand total	1, 968, 485, 500

Committee Recommendations

The committee recommends adoption of the projects and plans substantially as set forth in the bill, subject to certain qualifying remarks as follows (details and provisions of all items contained in the bill are set forth elsewhere in this report):

Control of obnoxious aquatic plants in navigable and allied waters.—The committee desires to make it clear that the Chief of Engineers in administering this program will be expected to fully coordinate all activities in furtherance of such a program with other interested Federal agencies. Such coordination should insure that there will be no overlapping or conflict with the programs and responsibilities of other agencies in associated control programs.

Hampton Creek, Va.—It is noted that local interests, due to accelerated development of shore areas, are unable to furnish areas for dredged spoil during periodic maintenance of the channels. The committee considers it equitable since other Federal projects in the Hampton Roads area use the Craney Island disposal area for the deposit of dredged spoil, that spoil from the Hampton Creek project also be deposited at Craney Island at no cost to local interests.

Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.—The committee has seen fit to include language in the bill providing that any funds appropriated for the project shall not be utilized until such time as the Indiana Dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by act of Congress. Also, the committee desires that the Chief of Engineers give full consideration to any changes or modifications in design of the project that may be suggested by the State of Indiana, provided such changes are consistent with the overall plan of development as proposed in House Document 160, 88th Congress.

Chocolate Bayou, Tex.—Prior to a request for funds to initiate construction of this project, the committee desires that the Chief of Engineers restudy the matter of cost sharing and advise the committee concerning potential additional users of this waterway, together with his recommendations for cost sharing.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, Calif.—Prior to a request for funds to initiate construction of that feature of the project for enlargement and deepening to 45 feet of a maneuvering area adjacent to a refinery owned by the Standard Oil Co. of California, the committee desires that the Chief of Engineers restudy the matter of cost sharing and advise the committee concerning potential additional users of this waterway, together with his recommendations for cost sharing. The committee desires to make it clear, however, that this restudy is not intended to delay prosecution of the remaining features of the project.

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway deicing study.—The committee realizes the extent of the problem involved in keeping the channels of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway open for navigation the entire year, but believes that the matter should be fully explored because of its economic and national defense aspects. While it is desirable to have year-round navigation on the Great Lakes and its connecting waterways, any extension of the navigation season would be useful. In this connection, if at any time during the course of this investigation, the Chief of Engineers determines it is feasible to extend the navigation season even if on a limited basis, he should report such findings to the committee in advance of completion of the entire survey.

Central and southern Florida project.—The committee has approved the construction of two projects as part of the overall central and southern Florida project. In view of the recent increase in monetary authorization provided for in Public Law 43, 89th Congress, the committee expects that the Chief of Engineers will prosecute these additional projects to the extent possible, within the monetary authorization made available for the comprehensive plan.

Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway, Mo.—Local interests believe they should not be required to furnish modified flowage easements needed for the recommended improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway. Cost of these easements is presently estimated at $5 million. Operation of the floodway is part of an overall plan for controlling floodwaters of the Mississippi River. The floodway is put into operation in order to protect areas outside of the floodway at the expense of lands in the floodway. Flowage easements for the presently authorized project were obtained by the Federal Government, as were similar easements needed for other floodways in the Mississippi River alluvial valley. In consideration of these factors, the committee concludes that the flowage easements necessary for operation of the floodway in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, should be acquired at Federal expense, and accordingly has included appropriate language in the bill.

St. Francis River Basin.—The Chief of Engineers in House Document 308, 88th Congress, recommended among other things, the construction of certain modifications in the St. Francis River Basin. Construction of these improvements as recommended by the Chief of Engineers would be subject to the conditions that local interests furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction and operation of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction; operate and maintain the works after completion; and make all necessary relocations to highway bridges. Local interests have requested that this new work for the St. Francis River Basin be authorized under the same requirements of local cooperation that apply to previously authorized work; namely, maintenance of the levees.

It is not clear to the committee, however, what the relationship of the projects recommended under House Document 308 are to the work previously authorized, specifically why previously authorized project did not have recommendations from the Corps of Engineers setting out the requirements for local cooperation in accordance with the 1936 Flood Control Act.

The committee is unable to make a judgment at this time whether a basis exists for making an exception to the normal requirement for local cooperation. However, the committee desires that the project go forward leaving the matter of local cooperation to be resolved by the committee at a later date after obtaining from the Chief of Engineers additional information.

The committee desires the Chief of Engineers review the requirements of the St. Francis River Basin project recommended modifications as they relate to local cooperation, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing and report to the committee within 1 year from the passage of this act.

The Chief of Engineers in his report should clearly define the local cooperation that is presently required under the existing project by

the Flood Control Act of 1946, which is proposed for the modification in accordance with present policies, together with his recommendations for an equitable solution to this matter.

Red River backwater area.—Local interests believe they should not be required to operate and maintain the pumping plant station recommended for authorization in the Red River backwater area, presently estimated to cost $110,000 annually. This pumping plant lies within an area which serves as a midriver reservoir for the storage of floodwaters originating in other regions of the country during major floods and is used exclusively for the removal of floodwaters during periods of high river stages. Similar pumping plants in the Mississippi River and tributaries project are maintained by the Federal Government.

The committee feels that the Federal Government should maintain and operate the pumping plant recommended for authorization in the Red River backwater area, thus placing the improvement in conformity with authorized pumping plants of a similar nature presently included in the Mississippi River and tributaries project. Also, the committee desires to make it clear that the pumping plant is used only for the removal of floodwaters and for no other purpose. On this basis, the committee feels it is justified in recommending Federal maintenance and operation of this facility.

Yazoo River backwater pumping plants.—The Mississippi River Commission in its report published as House Document No. 308, 88th Congress, recommended the substitution of gravity structures for the removal of interior drainage during periods of high water. However, the Chief of Engineers after careful review of the matter did not concur in the recommendations of the president, Mississippi River Commission. He concluded that the use of sump areas or ponding areas was desirable but that the existing authority for the construction of pumping plants should not be removed in case such items were subsequently needed.

The committee concurs in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and desires to make it clear that nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the pumping plants in the Yazoo backwater area as authorized in the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941.

Caddo Dam, La.—The Chief of Engineers in his report published as Senate Document No. 39, 89th Congress, recommends that the Federal Government reconstruct the existing Caddo Dam Federal navigation structure. The Chief of Engineers reports that the project is in very poor condition and is subject to failure if corrective measures are not taken at this time. He recommends reconstruction subject to the usual conditions of local cooperation, including lands, easements, and rights-of-way.

The Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget recommend reconstruction of the project subject to the conditions that local interests be required to maintain and operate the project after reconstruction.

The committee notes that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget represent a departure from the normal conditions of local cooperation for a Federal navigation structure, even though the project is not presently required in the interest of general navigation.

The committee after carefully considering all the facts in this case, feels that the benefits that will accrue to the project may justify maintenance and operation by local interests on an interim basis.

However, the committee desires to make it clear that local interests shall not be required to furnish any assurances of local cooperation other than those relating to operation and maintenance of the project, and that local interests will be relieved of such responsibility at such time as the project becomes part of a federally authorized navigation development.

Arkansas River navigation project (railroad bridge maintenance).—Congress, in 1946, authorized the multiple-purpose development of the Arkansas River Basin. The plan of improvement provides for coordinated development to serve navigation, produce hydroelectric power, afford additional flood control and provide related benefits in connection with other activities such as recreation and wildlife propagation.

The committee is informed that the navigation project as a whole is approximately 50 percent completed. The target date for the project to become operational is 1970. The project is estimated to cost in excess of $1 billion but after completion will produce benefits in excess of $65 million annually.

Concerning maintenance of railroad bridges, House Document No. 758, 79th Congress, contains the following provision:

> The Arkansas River Survey Board recommends that the following be constructed, maintained, and operated at Federal expense, provided local interests provide adequate terminal and transfer facilities for navigation, bear the increased cost of maintenance and operation of all altered rail and highway routes, including bridges and appurtenances * * *.

The committee, after a careful review of the above provision as it relates to increased maintenance of railroad bridges, considers it to be the intent of Congress that owners of railroad bridges should bear any increased costs of maintenance thus occasioned by the project, unless other local interests are willing to accept responsibility for such costs.

Pine Bluff, Ark.—The Chief of Engineers is relocating the existing gravity flow outfall sewer line at Pine Bluff, Ark., in connection with the Arkansas River navigation project. He finds that construction of a force-main outfall line will be more economical to the Federal Government. However, under the terms of the Arkansas River navigation project, local interests will be required to maintain and operate the system.

The committee notes that the city of Pine Bluff will receive no additional benefits as a result of the replacement of its sewer outfall system but is being asked to assume increased maintenance charges. Therefore, it is considered equitable for the Federal Government to assume such construction and increased maintenance costs as may be involved in the replacement of this facility, and the committee has accordingly included appropriate language in the bill.

Walnut Basin, Kans.—The committee recommends authorization of three reservoirs—El Dorado, Douglas, and Towanda—and two local protection projects at El Dorado and Winfield, Kans., proposed by the Walnut Basin plan. Evidence supplied the committee, supported by comments of the State of Kansas on the plan, reveals that while authorization of the entire basin plan is justified at this time,

special problems associated with the Towanda Reservoir deserve comment.

Towanda Reservoir constitutes major flood control structure in this basin plan. The State of Kansas, looking to the future, anticipates repetition and intensification of past, critical water shortages which will require the most efficient use of water from the Whitewater River on which Towanda Reservoir is proposed to be constructed. Unfortunately, all tributaries of the Whitewater do not supply high quality water. In periods of low flow, dilution may well become necessary to supply water from the Towanda Reservoir usable for municipal and some industrial uses.

Towanda should be constructed as an essential element of the flood protection plan. However, this committee, which also concerns itself with the availability of high-quality water supplies, endorses the recommendations of the State of Kansas; namely, that no funds for the construction of Towanda should be appropriated until the proposed design and operation of Towanda Reservoir have been approved by the State of Kansas based upon the effect upon the quality of future water supplies.

Further, the committee is convinced that every effort should be made to expedite maximum development of the associated Whitewater watershed. This development would provide some limited flood storage in the period prior to construction of Towanda. It would also provide watershed structures to hold back flow on poorer quality tributaries of the Whitewater in periods of low flow so as to preserve the vital water quality in Towanda. Indications are that some flood control benefits currently assigned to the Towanda structure can be assigned upstream watershed protection without jeopardizing the benefit-cost justification of Towanda and, at the same time, enhance the potential development of the watershed. The committee urges that this course be explored with the cooperation of all responsible agencies.

Indian Bend Wash, Ariz.—The committee notes that the Indian Bend Wash project has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.8 and will provide much-needed flood protection to the highly developed residential area of the city of Scottsdale and other areas along Indian Bend Wash. However, the city of Tempe, Ariz., located on Salt River downstream of Indian Bend Wash objects to construction of certain proposed improvements before adequate protection is provided for Tempe. Also, landowners in the vicinity of the upstream end of the project expressed opposition to the plan of improvement on the grounds that valuable real estate would be lost for development due to the flood easements required.

It is the view of the committee that the objections raised by the city of Tempe should be considered in the advanced planning stage, and that before requesting construction funds the Corps of Engineers should assure itself that the Indian Bend Wash project will not have adverse effects on the city of Tempe or the Salt River flood control works.

Further, it is the sense of the committee that the Corps of Engineers should recommend the design of this project which will render the lowest overall cost, including land acquisition by the Maricopa County Flood Control District for the Indian Bend Wash flood control project, provided that any additional Federal costs be shared

equally between the Federal Government and the responsible local governmental agency.

San Diego River (Mission Valley), Calif.—The committee is informed that floods in Mission Valley cause damages to transportation facilities, agricultural land and improvements, business and industrial property, utilities, and residential and public property.

The plan of improvement proposed by the Corps of Engineers will provide much-needed flood protection to the highly developed valley. However, in view of the seriousness of the flood problem, local interests desire to construct the recommended project works in Murphy Canyon prior to initiation of the project by the Corps of Engineers, and in return for such construction receive credit toward their required local cash contribution.

The committee appreciates the seriousness of the problem and while it makes no specific recommendation concerning reimbursement of local interests for work done on the Federal portion of a project, it does wish to draw attention to Public Law 857, 76th Congress. This law, approved October 15, 1940, provides for advancement of funds by local interests for construction of authorized projects by the Chief of Engineers. The law further provides for the repayment of such loans.

Application of cost-sharing guidelines to non-Federal public bodies in connection with flood control projects.—The committee notes its strong desire that the guidelines proposed for Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects in S. 1229 be applied by departments and agencies of the executive branch with flexibility in regard to flood protection programs developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In particular, the committee calls attention to the burden that would be imposed on many non-Federal public bodies by requiring them to share the separable costs attributable to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. The inability of such non-Federal public bodies to share in these costs would result in the denial of needed flood control facilities required to protect lives and property and communities.

In this regard, the committee also notes the intent of the Senate, as developed in the debate at the time of adoption of the conference report on S. 1229 on June 25, 1965, that flood protection projects under the Corps of Engineers, and involving recommendations about agreements with non-Federal public bodies, be submitted by the executive agencies and the Bureau of the Budget to this committee for decisions on authorization and for recommendation to the Senate. This intent most certainly represents the feelings of the members of this committee.

Further, the committee recognizes the benefits which come from recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, and it encourages such development. It does feel, however, that it would be wrong to deny flood protection facilities to communities and river basins because of guidelines established and administered by the executive agencies of the Federal Government. The consideration and authorization of these facilities is the responsibility of the Congress, and the committee does not want these guidelines used to make impossible the congressional consideration of projects and the appropriation of funds for such projects. Inability of non-Federal public bodies to share in the allocation of costs made in plans developed by executive agencies

should not result in the denial of flood protection afforded by projects which affect the areas involved.

Analysis of Title I

SECTION 101

This section summarizes the project authorizations for navigation and beach erosion control works in title I. The initial table lists the projects, document numbers, and estimated Federal costs. Pertinent information follows for each project.

Navigation and beach erosion control projects

Project	Document number [1]	Federal cost of new work
NAVIGATION		
Alpena Harbor, Mich	H. 151, 88th Cong	$806,000
Bayou La Batre, Ala	H. 327, 88th Cong	262,000
Bodega Bay, Calif	H. 106, 89th Cong	853,000
Broward County, Fla	H. 91, 89th Cong	1,093,000
Burns Waterway, Ind	H. 160, 88th Cong	25,000,000
Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, Va	H. 143, 89th Cong	7,095,000
Chetco River, Oreg	S. 21, 89th Cong	1,308,000
Chocolate Bayou, Tex	H. 217, 89th Cong	1,254,000
East Pass Channel to Gulf of Mexico, Fla	H. 194, 88th Cong	1,151,000
Edmunds Harbor, Wash	H. 147, 88th Cong	[2]
Frankfort Harbor, Mich	S. 16, 89th Cong	237,000
Hampton Creek, Va	H. 201, 89th Cong	[2]
Hawaiian Islands (coast of) for small craft, Hawaii	H. 353, 88th Cong	4,737,000
Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii	H. 68, 89th Cong	680,000
Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii	H. 93, 89th Cong	9,928,000
Indiana Harbor, Ind	H. 227, 89th Cong	96,000
Jacksonville Harbor, Fla	H. 214, 89th Cong	8,484,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	S. 28, 89th Cong	676,000
Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii	H. 75, 89th Cong	2,291,000
Lexington Harbor, Mich	H. 301, 88th Cong	563,000
Mermantau River, La	H. 239, 89th Cong	2,690,000
Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoals, Va	H. 187, 89th Cong	25,600,000
New York and New Jersey Channels, N.Y. and N.J	H. 108, 89th Cong	2,581,000
New York Harbor anchorages, New York	S. 17, 89th Cong	44,852,000
Oceanside Harbor, Calif	H. 76, 89th Cong	[2]
Perdido Pass Channel, Ala	S. 94, 88th Cong	625,000
Ponce de Leon Inlet, Fla	H. 74, 89th Cong	1,104,000
Port Orford, Oreg	S. 62, 88th Cong	696,000
Providence River and Harbor, R.I	S. 93, 88th Cong	13,900,000
Rocky River and Harbor, Ohio	H. 352, 88th Cong	235,000
Saginaw River, Mich	H. 240, 89th Cong	437,000
San Francisco Bay to Stockton, Calif	H. 208, 89th Cong	46,853,000
San Luis Harbor (Port San Luis), Calif	H. 148, 88th Cong	6,360,000
Savannah Harbor, Ga	H. 226, 89th Cong	7,112,000
Town and Fore Rivers, Mass	H. 247, 88th Cong	12,500,000
Tred Avon River, Md	H. 225, 89th Cong	323,000
West Harbor, Ohio	H. 245, 88th Cong	544,000
Total navigation (37 projects)		232,926,000
BEACH EROSION CONTROL		
Cliff Walk, Newport, R.I	H. 228, 89th Cong	340,000
Atlantic City, N.J	H. 325, 88th Cong	[3]
Evanston, Ill	H. 159, 89th Cong	392,000
Fort Pierce, Fla	H. 84, 89th Cong	220,000
Haleiwa Beach, Hawaii	H. 107, 89th Cong	572,400
Hunting Island Beach, S. C	H. 323, 88th Cong	319,000
Perth Amboy, N.J	H. 186, 89th Cong	82,000
Waikiki Beach, Hawaii	H. 104, 89th Cong	2,490,000
Total, beach erosion control (8 projects)		4,415,400
Grand total, title I (45 projects)		237,341,400

[1] H—House document; S—Senate document.
[2] Maintenance only.
[3] Beach nourishment only.

ALPENA HARBOR, MICH.

(H. Doc. 151, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Alpena Harbor, Mich., is on the northwest shore of Thunder Bay, a large indentation on the western shore of Lake Huron.

Authority.—Similar resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, May 18, 1956, and by the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, June 27, 1956.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for channels varying from 15 to 21 feet deep; a turning basin opposite the Fletcher Paper Co. dock, 15 feet deep and about 3.7 acres; and a rubble mound breakwater 970 feet long on the south side of and parallel to the river entrance channel and extending from shore.

Navigation problem.—There are inadequate depths in the channel for economical operation of large, modern, self-unloading vessels and an appropriate turning basin for these vessels is needed.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A bay channel 24 feet deep and 200 feet wide from deep water in Thunder Bay to a point 300 feet lakeward of the Alpena Light; thence an entrance channel 23 feet deep narrowing to a width of 100 feet at a point 700 feet upstream of the light; thence a river channel 22 feet deep and 100 feet wide to the Second Avenue Bridge; a turning basin 18 feet deep, trapezoidal in shape, with a maximum width of 700 feet including the channel width and a maximum length of 900 feet along the channel line, including the removal of the existing rubble breakwater; and a breakwater paralleling the lakeward side of the new turning basin.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1962).—

Federal	$695,000
Non-Federal	33,000
Total	728,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$25,300	$1,500	$26,800
Maintenance and operation	2,600		2,600
Total	27,900	1,500	29,400
Annual benefits: Transportation savings			41,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvement; provide the necessary terminal facilities at the Abitibi Corp. to accommodate the prospective commerce considered in this report; and when and where necessary dredge and maintain the areas between the Federal improvement and terminal facilities to depths commen-

surate with the improved Federal channel. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—There are inadequate depths in the channel for economical operation of large, modern self-unloading vessels, and an appropriate turning basin for these vessels is needed. The committee notes the need for this improvement and that the benefits are ample to justify the project. However, it believes that in order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron an additional increment of 1 foot in channel depths should be provided. This increases the cost of the project by $111,000 for a total estimated cost of $806,000. The benefit-to-cost ratio then becomes 1.2 to 1.

BAYOU LA BATRE, ALA.

(H. Doc. 327, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Bayou La Batre is located on the gulf coast of Alabama about 30 miles southwest of Mobile, Ala.

Authority.—Resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committees of the U.S. Senate on May 24, 1960, and by the House of Representatives on June 30, 1960.

Existing project.—Provides for a navigation channel of 9-foot depth and 100-foot width from Mississippi Sound and up Bayou La Batre, an overall distance of about 24,000 feet.

Navigation problem.—Fully loaded fishing boats are damaged by groundings in the present channel. Deeper channels are needed also to accommodate larger more efficient commercial fishing vessels operating along the gulf coast.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Project to be modified to provide a channel 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Mississippi Sound to a point about 2,800 feet below the highway bridge at the town of Bayou La Batre, thence narrowing to 75 feet at the same depth to the bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of September 1963).—

Federal	$262,000
Non-Federal	2,000
Total	264,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$10,000		$10,000
Maintenance dredging	25,000		25,000
Maintenance of navigation aids	1,000		1,000
Total	36,000		36,000
Annual benefits:			
Elimination of vessel damage			9,000
Savings to commercial fishing			12,500
Increased fish catch			17,000
Total			38,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, buklheads, and embankments therefor or the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction and subsequent maintenance; provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to comply with the provisions of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Alabama: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the proposed deepening of the entrance channel into Bayou La Batre will increase efficiency of vessel operations and decrease damage from groundings, thereby lowering transportation costs to the fishing fleet operating in the area. The committee believes that the improvements are economically justified and that the allocation of costs between the Federal Government and local interests is equitable.

BODEGA BAY, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 106, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Bodega Bay is located on the Pacific coast about 58 miles north of San Francisco. Bodega Harbor is at the north end and separated from the bay by a sandspit which extends westward from the mainland toward Bodega Head.

Authority.—Resolution, House Committee on Public Works, adopted June 3, 1959.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project, completed in 1943, provides for entrance jetties 1,130 feet and 1,650 feet long; a bulkhead to retain the sandspit; an entrance channel 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide; thence a channel of the same dimensions to the town of Bodega Bay and southeasterly along the shore for a distance of 4,200 feet, with three turning basins. The total length of channel including the turning basins is about 16,000 feet. Local interests have dredged a mooring area along the north shore of Doran Beach near the existing project channel for the accommodation of Coast Guard vessels. They have also provided terminal and moorage facilities as needed.

Navigation problem.—The channel, turning basin, and moorage areas at the town of Bodega Bay are exposed to storm waves which cause damage to vessels and piers. There is also need for additional facilities for recreational craft.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A rock and riprap protected earth mole extending from the shore around the innermost turning

basin and paralleling the existing channel for a total distance of 4,500 feet. A channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide on the north side of Doran Beach spit.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

	Mole	Doran Beach Channel	Total
Federal	$750,000	$103,000	$853,000
Non-Federal	420,000	103,000	[1] 523,000
Total	1,170,000	206,000	1,376,000

[1] Cash contribution.

Project economics.—

	Mole	Doran Beach Channel	Total
Annual charges:			
Federal:			
Interest and amortization	$29,000	$4,500	$33,500
Maintenance	5,000	10,300	15,300
Total Federal	34,000	14,800	48,800
Non-Federal: Interest and amortization	16,000	4,000	20,000
Total annual charges	50,000	18,800	68,800
Annual benefits:			
Commercial fishing	47,000	0	47,000
Recreational boating	84,000	40,000	124,000
Total	131,000	40,000	171,000
Benefit-cost ratio	2.6	2.1	2.5

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash prior to construction 36 percent of the first cost of construction of the mole and 50 percent of the first cost of dredging the Doran Beach channel, such contributions being presently estimated at $420,000 and $103,000, respectively. Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way. Hold and save the United States free from damages. Provide and maintain an adequate service frontage and a public landing with suitable supply facilities at each location, necessary mooring facilities for local and transient boats with adequate depths in berthing areas, utilities, access roads and parking areas, and other necessary public use shore facilities, open to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The proposed mole and basin will provide protection to boats during rough weather thereby reducing damages and delays which increase operating costs and reduce fish catch. The Doran Beach channel will provide access to a development of considerable magnitude planned by Sonoma County. The committee notes that the project would have considerable commercial significance in addition to its recreational potential and is well justified by the overall benefits. The committee believes that the large contribution by local interests is equitable because of the large proportion of recreational benefits.

BROWARD COUNTY AND HILLSBORO INLET, FLA.

(H. Doc. 91, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Broward County is on the lower east coast of Florida about 300 miles south of Jacksonville and about 30 miles north of Miami. Hillsboro Inlet is located in the northern part of Broward County.

Authority.—Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives, on June 27, 1956; section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930; and in partial response to Public Law 71, 84th Congress.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project.

Beach erosion and navigation problems.—At a number of locations along the shoreline of Broward County erosion has undermined or has threatened to undermine shore-front structures. Recession of the shore is causing the loss of valuable property. Small craft incur damage and are frequently delayed because of hazardous conditions in the shallow shifting entrance channel.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvements for beach erosion control in Broward County, Fla., from the north county line to Hillsboro Inlet and from Port Everglades to the south county line, and a combined beach erosion control and navigation improvement of Hillsboro Inlet and the shore south thereof to Port Everglades. The beach erosion control features comprise restoration of a protective beach to a general width of 100 feet with berm elevation of 10 feet above mean low water and periodic nourishment thereof. The navigation features would provide for a channel 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Intracoastal Waterway to a point 1,500 feet oceanward in Hillsboro Inlet, thence 10 feet deep and 150 feet wide to deep water in the Atlantic Ocean; jetties on the north and south sides of the ocean entrance; and a permanently based floating dredge to maintain the navigation channel and transfer sand across the inlet with the provision that the dredge be replaced by a trestle-mounted sand-transfer plant if experience proves the dredge to be unsatisfactory.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1962).—

Federal	$1,093,000
Non-Federal	4,485,000
Total	5,578,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$41,900	$170,200	$212,100
Maintenance and operation	36.700	43,600	80,300
Periodic nourishment	49,400	251,600	301,000
Total	128,000	465,400	593,400
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating			85,000
Beach restoration			1,690,800
Total			1,775,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.0.

Local cooperation.—Contribute toward the first cost of providing the recommended improvements for navigation and beach erosion control in the amount of the following percentages (exclusive of navigation aids, lands, easements, rights-of-way, and preproject expenditures by local interests at Pompano Beach) in such manner as may be acceptable to the Chief of Engineers for construction to be performed by the Corps of Engineers, the final amount to be ascertained after actual costs have been determined: (1) 90.5 percent of the first cost of the recommended beach erosion restoration in the reach between the north county line and Hillsboro Inlet, now estimated at $833,000; (2) 90 percent of the first cost allocated to beach erosion control and 50 percent of the first cost allocated to navigation in the combined beach erosion-navigation project between Hillsboro Inlet and Port Everglades, estimated at $2,123,000 and $337,000, respectively; and (3) 72.4 percent of the first cost of the recommended beach restoration in the reach between Port Everglades and the south county line, now estimated at $1,115,000; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the projects and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, and suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil not used for beach nourishment, and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; obtain approval of the Chief of Engineers, prior to commencement of work on a project, of detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecution of work on the project, if local interests desire to construct the beach erosion features; furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that during the economic life of the project they will (1) hold and save the United States free from damages that may be attributed to the construction and maintenance of the projects; (2) provide and maintain without cost to the United States an adequate public landing or wharf at Hillsboro Inlet with provisions for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, available to all on equal terms; (3) establish a properly constituted and competent nonprofit public body empowered to cooperate financially and to provide and operate essential local facilities for navigation at Hillsboro Inlet open to all on equal terms; (4) control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers; (5) maintain continued ownership of the publicly owned shores upon which the amount of Federal participation is based and their administration for public use; (6) maintain all project works except the jetties at Hillsboro Inlet and the aids to navigation there, perform periodic beach nourishment, operate and maintain the floating dredge for its period of use, maintain the navigation channel at Hillsboro Inlet for the same period, and operate and maintain the sand transfer plant should it be constructed, at which time maintenance of the navigation channel would revert to the United States, subject to Federal participation as recommended herein. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Favorable.
State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Restoration and stabilization of the shoreline of Broward County are necessary for the protection of public property and to preserve the needed recreational beaches. The shallow shifting entrance channel in Hillsboro Inlet is unsafe and inadequate to accommodate the recreational boats based in the area. The committee notes that the improvements would provide protection of valuable shore-front property and restore needed recreational beach widths. The improvements also would provide a stable, protected channel for use by local recreational craft.

BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IND.

(H. Doc. 160, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The site of the proposed harbor is in the vicinity of Burns Ditch on the south shore of Lake Michigan in Porter County, Ind., about 9 miles east of Gary Harbor, Ind.

Authority.—Similar resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives on May 18, and June 27, 1956, respectively. It is also in response to a resolution of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives adopted on March 15, 1949.

Existing project.—There is no existing project for a harbor on the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan at or in the vicinity of the mouth of Burns Ditch.

Navigation problem.—Various interests in the State of Indiana desire a new public harbor on the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Burns Ditch.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The Chief of Engineers recommends improvements for a north breakwater 4,050 feet long; a west breakwater 1,330 feet long; an east breakwater 1,340 feet long; an approach channel 30 feet deep and 400 feet wide, extending from deep water in Lake Michigan to the north end of the east breakwater; an entrance channel 28 feet deep and 800 feet wide, from the end of the approach channel to the west breakwater; and an outer harbor area of 225 acres, 27 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1961).—

Federal	$25,000,000
Non-Federal	0
Total	25,000,000

Project economics.—

Annual charges (all Federal):	
Interest and amortization	$1,007,700
Maintenance	100,000
Maintenance navigational aids	300
Total	1,108,000
Annual benefits:	
Elimination of need for private hrbor	930,000
Transportation savings	896,000
Total	1,826,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damage due to the construction and maintenance of the project, including damages resulting from any shore erosion that may occur; reimburse the United States for all excess costs for dredging should this work be done by other than hydraulic methods; provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas; construct a fully integrated steel plant; and construct adequate east- and west-shore connections having lengths of 1,820 and 2,500 feet, respectively. The construction of these shore connections is to be done either in advance of or concurrently with construction of the breakwaters by the United States. Representatives of the State of Indiana have stated that formal assurances covering the items of local cooperation will be furnished when required.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Indiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress subject to the following comment: "The Bureau of the Budget recommends authorization of the Burns Waterway Harbor, provided that prior to expenditure of funds for construction, local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the items of local cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers will be complied with and additionally that:

1. Arrangements and schedules for providing public terminals and transfer facilities are adequate to support the traffic on which project benefits are based and such facilities will be financed on a self-liquidating basis.

2. Water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the harbor.

3. There will be construction of two integrated steel mills on a schedule generally consistent with the completion of the harbor—or of one integrated steel mill if a detailed study by the Chief of Engineers of traffic related to the other mill, and to other transshipped commodities, clearly support economic justification of the project. The study should be supplemented by an appraisal in collaboration with other interested Federal agencies of prospective coal shipments through the proposed harbor with appropriate consideration of other possible alternative modes of coal movement such as barge-to-lake vessel transshipment.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary concurs in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the

Budget and recommends further that the State of Indiana furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent possible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreation areas in the general vicinity of the harbor.

Remarks.—The committee notes that two companies are constructing steel mills in the harbor area. It believes that every effort should be made to control to the maximum extent feasible water and air pollution sources in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreation areas in the general vicinity of the harbor. The committee also notes that the proposed harbor and the proposed dunes conservation project would be compatible.

For additional comments concerning this project, see "Committee Recommendations."

CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS AND NORFOLK HARBOR, HAMPTON ROADS, VA.

(H. Doc. 143, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The channel to Newport News is at the southern end of Chesapeake Bay in the western section of Hampton Roads, Va.

Authority.—Two resolutions adopted July 31, 1957, by the House Public Works Committee.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for Norfolk Harbor provides for a main channel 40 feet deep, 1,500 feet wide from deep water in Hampton Roads to a point just south of the Hampton Roads Army terminals; thence 40 feet deep and 750 feet wide to the mouth of Southern Branch, thence 40 feet deep and 450 feet wide up this branch to the Norfolk and Western Belt Line Railroad bridge, a total distance of 13.2 miles, including an approach and turning area to the same depth opposite the Norfolk Naval Shipyard; thence 35 feet deep and 375 to 250 feet wide for 4.1 miles to a turning basin of the same depth; for subsidiary channels in Eastern and Western Branches and Scotts Creek; anchorage areas on the west side of the 40-foot channel opposite Lamberts Point and south of Craney Island aggregating 173 acres, consisting of: one anchorage space 1,500 feet square and 38 feet deep; one anchorage space 1,500 feet square and 35 feet deep; and one anchorage space 1,000 feet wide, 3,000 feet long, and 20 feet deep; another anchorage of 45 acres, 12 feet deep, near Pinners Point; and a disposal area of about 2,500 acres, adjacent to and north of Craney Island, enclosed by levees, three sluiceways in the westerly levee, an access road, facilities for sump rehandling of hopper-dredged material, an anchorage for the sump rehandler, an approach area 300 by 3,600 feet, 30 feet deep, connecting the anchorage with Norfolk Harbor 40-foot channel, and facilities for contract rehandling of bucket dredging consisting of a rehandling basin and provided with approach-exit channels 200 feet wide and 18 feet deep to Norfolk Harbor 40-foot channel.

Navigation problem.—There are no improved anchorages in Hampton Roads capable of accommodating large, deep-draft vessels without encroachment on the adjacent project channels, and movement of large vessels in the 600-foot channel to Newport News is hazardous.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for the following: The existing project for channel to Newport News, Va., be modified to

provide for (1) an increase in the project width of channel from 600 to 800 feet and to a project depth of 40 feet, and (2) two deep-draft anchorage berths, in anchorage G opposite Newport News, to a depth of 40 feet over a 1,200-foot swinging radius, and with suitable flared approach and exit areas thereto; at an estimated cost to the United States of $4,122,000 for construction, and $77,900 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required; and the existing project for Norfolk Harbor, Va., be modified to provide two deep-draft anchorage berths in anchorages D and H opposite Sewells Point, Norfolk, to a depth of 40 feet over a 1,200-foot swinging radius, and with suitable flared approach and exit areas thereto; at an estimated cost to the United States of $2,973,000 for construction, and $59,300 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

Federal	$7,095,000
Non-Federal	
Total	7,095,000

Project economics.—

	Federal
Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$393,400
Maintenance	137,200
Total	530,600
Annual benefits:	
Reduced anchorage costs	444,000
Reduction in vessel traveltime	150,000
Total	594,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—No additional requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, in view of the possibility that construction of a pipeline from the Gulf States to east coast terminals may materially affect the economic justification of the proposed project the Bureau states that if the project is authorized it would expect a reevaluation of the project in light of this possibility prior to any request for funds for initiation of construction.

Remarks.—The proposed anchorages and the wider channel will improve operating conditions and provide safer use of the channel. The committee believes that the project is needed and notes that it is economically justified.

CHETCO RIVER, OREG.

(S. Doc. 21, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Chetco River discharges into Chetco Cove on the Pacific Ocean about 4 miles northwest of the Oregon-California boundary.

Authority.—Senate Committee on Public Works Resolution adopted April 28, 1958.

Existing project.—The existing Federal navigation project provides for a north jetty 850 feet long, a south jetty 1,550 feet long, and

dredging to stabilize the channel through the bar at the mouth of the river. Local interests have constructed a small boat basin along the east bank of the river and a wharf.

Navigation problem.—The existing entrance channel restricts the safe passage of lumber and commercial fishing boats to high tides and daylight hours. The small boat basin provided by local interests is congested and lacks adequate space for turning and maneuvering of commercial fishing boats.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for an entrance channel 120 feet wide and 14 feet deep; a 450-foot extension of the north jetty; a barge turning basin 250 feet wide, 650 feet long, and 14 feet deep; a protctive dike 1,800 feet long; and an access channel to the small boat basin 100 feet wide and 12 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964).—

Federal	$1, 308, 000
Non-Federal	27, 000
Total	1, 335, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$51, 400	$1, 100	$52, 500
Maintenance and operation	25, 000		25, 000
Maintenance of navigation aids	1, 000		1, 000
Total	77, 400	1, 100	78, 500
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings			134, 500
Reduction of barge damages			6, 000
Commercial fishing			138, 400
Recreational boating			9, 500
Harbor of refuge			5, 000
Total			293, 400

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.7.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 6.5 percent of the first cost of the small boat access channel and that portion of the dike thereto, such contribution, presently estimated at $9,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction; provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain depths in berthing and mooring areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with project depths; provide and maintain an adequate service frontage, launching ramp, and a public landing with suitable facilities, open to all on equal terms; and accomplish alterations as required in sewer, water supply, drainge, and other utility facilities, as well as their maintenance. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Oregon: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The existing entrance channel restricts the safe passage of lumber and commercial fishing boats to high tides and daylight hours. The small boat basin constructed by local interests is con-

gested and lacks adequate space for turning and maneuvering of commercial fishing boats. The committee notes the proposed improvements are amply justified.

CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TEX.

(H. Doc. 217, 89th Cong.)

Locations.—Chocolate Bayou is in southeastern Texas, between the Brazos River and Galveston Bay. The bayou rises about 20 miles southwest of Houston, Tex., flows southeasterly across Brazoria County and empties into Chocolate Bay. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide, crosses Chocolate Bay about 26 miles west of Galveston, Tex., and 17 miles east of Freeport, Tex.

Authority.—Resolutions of Senate and House Public Works Committees adopted June 30, 1960.

Existing project.—The authorized Chocolate Bayou project provides for a channel 4 feet deep and 100 feet wide extending from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway through Chocolate Bay to the 4-foot depth in Chocolate Bayou. In 1962, the Monsanto Chemical Co. dredged a channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway 8.2 miles to a basin at their new plant on Chocolate Bayou.

Navigation problem.—There is a need for enlargement of the existing locally dredged channel and extension as necessary to afford the Chocolate Bayou area the same type accommodations for barge service as are available on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. In connection therewith there is a need for a barrier to mitigate damages from salt water intrusion.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement provides for a channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide extending from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway through Chocolate Bay and Chocolate Bayou to project channel mile 8.2; thence 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide to a turning basin 9 feet deep and 600 feet square near channel mile 13.2; a salt water barrier in Chocolate Bayou about 3.7 miles upstream from the turning basin.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964).—

Federal	$1,254,000
Non-Federal	351,000
Total	1,605,000

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Federal	$63,600
Non-Federal	13,400
Total	77,000
Annual benefits:	
Transportation savings	220,000
Reduction in navigation hazards	30,000
Prevention of salt water intrusion	9,000
Total	259,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the improvements and for aids to navigation upon request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required to the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvements; provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations of pipelines, powerlines, utility lines, cables, and highway facilities, when and as required for construction of the project; assume all obligations of ownership, operation, and maintenance of the salt water barrier and appurtenances upon its completion. Local interests have indicated their willingness to comply.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies:

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: No objection.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget notes that the project in the lower reach would initially serve only the Montsanto Chemical Co. and in the upper reach would, at least initially, benefit only the Matagorda Shell Co. and further that it is not clear just how soon additional shippers would benefit from the modified channel. The Bureau believes that in addition to the conditions of local cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers, and in accord with established policy concerning single users, some provision for special cost sharing should be required. A reasonable basis would be payment by local interests, annually, until such time as multiple use of the channel actually occurs, of 50 percent of the annual charges for interest and amortization of the Federal first cost of the facilities involved. Subject to consideration of the recommendation, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army concurs with the views of the Bureau of the Budget on the single beneficiary question and recommends that the authorization, in addition to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers, require a finding by the Secretary of the Army as to appropriate single beneficiary contributions, if any, prior to appropriation of construction funds.

Remarks.—See "Committee recommendations" for comments on this project.

EAST PASS CHANNEL FROM THE GULF OF MEXICO INTO CHOCTAWHATCHEE BAY, FLA.

(H. Doc. 194, 88th Cong.)

Location.—On the northwest Florida coast about midway between Pensacola and Panama City.

Authority.—Similar resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on January 15, 1960, and May 19, 1960, respectively.

Existing project.—Provides for maintenance of a channel 12 feet deep, 180 feet wide, and about 3 miles long from Choctawhatchee Bay into the Gulf of Mexico, and maintenance of a channel 6 feet deep, 100 feet wide, and about 2,000 feet long from East Pass into Old Pass Lagoon.

Navigation problem.—The pass is not deep enough to enable safe navigation, and shoals rapidly. Wave action often prevents navigation through the pass. Numerous accidents and loss of life have occurred because of present navigation conditions.

Recommended plant of improvement.—Modification of existing project to provide for relocation of the entrance channel from the Gulf of Mexico to a more central position in the inlet and stabilization thereof with twin jetties extending to the seaward end of the channel.

Estimated cost (price level of March 1963).—

Federal	$1,151,000
Non-Federal	493,000
Total	1,644,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$45,100	$21,100	$66,200
Maintenance	14,400		14,400
Total	59,500	21,100	80,600
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating			85,000
Commercial fishing			5,000
National defense			48,200
Harbor of refuge			20,000
Total			158,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.0.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 30 percent of the first cost of construction, such contribution presently estimated at $493,000; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon request of the Chief of Engineers, including spoil disposal areas necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor, or the cost of such works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance thereof. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Remarks.—The navigation channel in East Pass is unsafe and inadequate to accommodate existing navigation. Numerous accidents resulting in loss of life and considerable vessel damage have occurred because of the present navigation conditions. The committee notes that construction of the recommended improvements would provide a stable, protected channel for use by the commercial fishing, recreation, and Defense Department vessels based in the area. The improvement is needed and justified by the anticipated benefits which are sufficiently local in nature to warrant a substantial cash contribution.

EDMONDS HARBOR, WASH.

(H. Doc. 147, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Edmonds Harbor is located on the easterly shore of Puget Sound about 9 miles north of Seattle, Wash.

Authority.—Resolutions, Senate and House Committees on Public Works, adopted November 24, 1958, and June 3, 1959, respectively.

Existing project.—There is no Federal navigation project at this locality. In April 1962 local interests constructed a small boat harbor which provides for a mooring basin, two breakwaters, and an entrance channel. Shore facilities have been provided for the small boat harbor, ferry, barge, and other terminals.

Navigation problem.—Local interests desire Federal maintenance of the breakwaters and entrance channel.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Federal maintenance of the breakwater and entrance channel at an estimated annual cost of $5,000.

Estimated cost (if constructed as a Federal project).—

Federal	$229,100
Non-Federal	185,400
Total	414,500

Project economics (if constructed as Federal project).—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$8,300	$10,200	$18,500
Maintenance and operation	5,000	0	5,000
Total	13,300	10,200	23,500
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating			52,000
Commercial transportation savings			8,500
Land enhancement			800
Total			61,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.6.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way including spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free

from damages; provide and maintain planned depths in the interior basin and the necessary mooring facilities and utilities, including a public landing with suitable supply facilities open to all on equal terms; regulate the use, growth, and free development of all necessary moorage facilities with the understanding that said facilities will open to all on equal terms.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Washington: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Local interests have constructed a small-boat basin for recreational craft and desire Federal maintenance of the breakwater and entrance channel. The committee notes that the recently constructed basin appears adequate to serve the foreseeable needs of the locally owned recreational; that it will be adequate for occasional use by U.S. Coast Guard vessels and for commercial fishing vessels; that it will provide a harbor of refuge for recreational and commercial small boats transiting the exposed coast; and that the breakwater and basin facilities have been constructed to high engineering standards. The committee notes that the project is economically justified and considers that Federal maintenance of the breakwater and entrance channel is warranted.

FRANKFORT HARBOR, MICH.

(S. Doc. 16, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Frankfort Harbor is on the east shore of Lake Michigan, about 204 miles northeasterly of Chicago, Ill.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate, adopted September 18, 1957.

Existing project.—The Federal project, completed in 1939, consists of two breakwaters, 450 feet apart at the outer ends, the north breakwater being 1,972 feet long and the south breakwater, 2,588 feet long; an outer basin inside the breakwaters, 20 feet deep, 800 feet wide near the entrance, 600 feet wide at the inner end, and about one-fourth mile long; a channel between piers 18 feet deep and approximately 1,000 feet long connecting the outer basin and Lake Betsie; and an interior basin, approximately 800 feet wide, 1,200 feet long, and 18 feet deep, dredged to within 50 feet of existing structures in that area in Lake Betsie west of the east boundary of Fifth Street extended, of the city of Frankfort.

Navigation problem.—Existing depths in the approach and entrance channels are not sufficient to permit the larger lake tankers to enter fully loaded. Car ferries have run aground east of the dredged basin during periods of adverse ice and wind conditons, and recreational craft have insufficient anchorage and turining area near the public dock.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Deepen the approach and entrance channels to a depth of 24 feet from deep water in Lake Michigan to a point 500 feet landward of the opening between the breakwaters, over the enter width outside the breakwaters and to a maximum width of 500 feet inside the breakwaters; thence to a depth of 23 feet through the inner portion of the outer basin to the outer end of the north pier, over widths decreasing from 500 feet to 160 feet; and thence to a depth of 22 feet between the piers to the inner basin in Lake

Betsie; extend the interior basin 350 feet in an easterly direction at a depth of 18 feet to provide an overall basin length of about 1,550 feet; and provide a recreational craft anchorage area 10 feet deep and 300 feet wide, extending 600 feet eastward of the proposed east limit of the interior basin, with its north side in line with the north limit of the basin.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1963).—

Federal	$237,000
Non-Federal	31,000
Total	268,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$9,200	$1,200	$10,400
Maintenance	5,000	0	5,000
Total	14,200	1,200	15,400
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings			12,350
Recreational boating			10,400
Total			22,750

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of the first cost of construction of the recreational craft anchorage area, such contribution being presently estimated at $31,000, to be paid in a lump-sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the improvements upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor, or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and subsequent maintenance of the improvements; maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and a public landing for local and transient craft, open to all on equal terms, with depths commensurate with the depth of the Federal anchorage area; reserve mooring facilities and space within the anchorage area adequate for the accommodation of transient craft; and construct the necessary terminal facilities to accommodate the prospective fuel oil commerce. Local interests are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The operation of a rail and rail-car ferry terminal at Frankfort Harbor provides the principal source of income to residents of the city of Frankfort and the village of Elberta. The deeper channels will permit the larger lake tankers to enter fully loaded, the basin extension will provide safer conditions for the car ferries, and the

recreational anchorage area will meet the needs of the recreational craft. The items of local contribution including the cash contribution are considered appropriate. The project has a favorable economic ratio and the committee recommends its approval.

HAMPTON CREEK, VA.

(Oct. 15, 1963)

Location.—Hampton Creek is a tidal estuary on the north side of Hampton Roads, Va., and 2 miles west of Chesapeake Bay.

Authority.—Resolution by the House Public Works Committee adopted April 5, 1949.

Existing project.—A channel 12 feet deep across Hampton Flats and up the creek to the Queen Street Bridge, a distance of about 2 miles, over a width of 200 feet in the outer portion and 150 feet in the creek; and a channel 12 feet deep and 80 to 100 feet wide for 0.6 of a mile in Herberts Creek.

Navigation problem.—Accelerated development of shore areas since adoption of the project has made it impossible for local interests to furnish reasonable shore disposal areas for dredge spoil.

Recommended plan of improvement.—That the existing project for Hampton Creek, Va., be modified to delete the requirement that local interests furnish, free of cost to the United States, suitable areas for disposal of dredged material from the project.

Estimated cost.—Maintenance only.

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Maintenance and operation	$31, 300
Maintenance, navigational aids	300
Total	31, 600
Annual benefits:	
Transportation savings	139, 000
Harbor of refuge	1, 000
Total	140, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.4.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from claims for damages. Local interests are willing to comply with the requirement of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Commonwealth of Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau states that with respect to the recommendation for deletion of the requirement that local interests furnish spoil disposal areas, it believes that it is possible to establish an arrangement more nearly in keeping with the intent of the original authorization and yet equitable to both local interests and the Federal Government. The Bureau recommends that local interests participate in the cost of spoil disposal by contributing in cash the capital investment increment of the cost of spoil disposal in the Craney Island disposal area. It states that this cost is currently

9 cents per cubic yard and the cost to local interests would be $27,260 for the initial rehabilitation and $810 per year for annual maintenance over the remaining life of the project.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army agrees with the views of the Bureau of the Budget.

Remarks.—For remarks concerning this project see "Committee recommendations."

COASTS OF THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, HARBORS FOR LIGHT-DRAFT VESSELS

(H. Doc. 353, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The harbors are located at various communities on the islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, and Hawaii.

Authority.—River and Harbor Act of May 17, 1950.

Existing project.—There are no Federal navigation improvements in Hawaii specifically for the use of small boats. There are seven federally improved commercial harbors, six of which are 35 feet deep and one 23 feet deep. The harbors with 35-foot depth are at Port Allen and Nawiliwili Harbors on Kauai, Honolulu Harbor on Oahu, Kahului Harbor on Maui, and Hilo and Kawaihae Harbors on Hawaii; the 23-foot harbor is at Kaunakakai on Molokai. There are 20 harbors for small boats along the shores of the islands, 15 owned by the State, and 5 by private interests.

Navigation problem.—There is need for additional protected harbors at various localities in the Hawaiian Islands for existing and future recreational and commercial fishing craft.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for eight small-boat harbors at the following locations: Hanalei Bay, Kauai; Waianae, Oahu; Heeia-Kea, Oahu; Kailua, Oahu; Maunalua Bay, Oahu; Lahaina, Maui; Hana, Maui, and Reeds Bay, Hawaii.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1962).—

Location	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Hanalei Bay, Kaui	$347,000	$530,000	$877,000
Waianae, Oahu	933,000	934,000	1,867,000
Heeia-Kea, Oahu	409,000	437,000	846,000
Kailua, Oahu	244,000	485,000	729,000
Maunalua Bay, Oahu	513,000	657,000	1,170,000
Lahaina, Maui	364,000	344,000	708,000
Hana, Maui	1,679,000	189,000	1,868,000
Reeds Bay, Hawaii	248,000	274,000	522,000
Total	4,737,000	3,850,000	8,587,000

Project economics and benefit-cost ratio.—

Location	Annual charges	Annual benefits	Benefit-cost ratio
Hanalei Bay, Kaui	$36,500	$47,100	1.3
Waianae, Oahu	85,000	96,100	1.1
Heeia-Kea, Oahu	38,100	211,300	5.5
Kailua, Oahu	34,600	52,700	1.5
Maunalua Bay, Oahu	54,600	232,200	4.2
Lahaina, Maui	32,900	47,400	1.4
Hana, Maui	88,200	107,100	1.2
Reeds Bay, Hawaii	24,600	53,300	2.2
Total	394,500	847,200	2.1

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash a part of the first cost of construction of the general navigation facilities comprising breakwaters, protective roles, and entrance channels, to be paid in a lump-sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined, as follows:

Location	Construction cost [1]	Local cash contribution	
		Percent	Present estimate
Hanalei Bay, Kauai	$669,000	48.1	$322,000
Waianae, Oahu	1,794,000	48.0	861,000
Heeia-Kea, Oahu	808,000	49.4	399,000
Kailua, Oahu	487,000	50.0	243,000
Maunalua Bay, Oahu	1,023,000	49.9	510,000
Lahaina, Maui	685,000	46.9	321,000
Hana, Maui	1,839,000	8.7	160,000
Reeds Bay, Hawaii	496,000	50.0	248,000
Total	7,801,000	39.3	3,064,000

[1] Excludes non-Federal costs for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations.

provide lands, easements and rights-of-way, including suitable spoil disposal areas with necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; provide and maintain berthing or mooring facilities and attendant utilities, including a public landing with suitable supply facilities open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain depths in the berthing and mooring areas and in the local access channels, commensurate with the depths provided in the related project area; provide and maintain all appropriate onshore structures, access roads, parking areas, public restrooms, and boat-launching ramps as necessary to insure a complete and adequate project; and accomplish necessary utility, drainage or other relocations or alterations. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The eight recommended small-boat harbors would be the first Federal navigation improvements in Hawaii specifically for small-boat use, if approved. Even though there is a total of 20 small-boat harbors at present, 15 of which are State owned and 5 privately owned, the present pace of increase in small-boat ownership and use has far outrun available facilities. Given the extensive coastline of the islands, and the broad waters serving as interisland navigational routes, heavier use of the already overtaxed small-boat harbors of the State is foreseen. The committee considers the harbors justified and meritorious as Federal projects.

HONOKAHAU HARBOR, HAWAII

(H. Doc. 68, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Honokahau Bay is on the west coast of the island of Hawaii. The site of the proposed project is about 28 nautical miles south of the Federal deepwater harbor at kawaihae and about 90 road

miles from Hilo, Hawaii. The navigation distance to Honolulu on the island of Oahu is approximately 150 nautical miles.

Authority.—Section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of May 17, 1950.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project at Honokahau Bay. There are public boating facilities at Kailua Bay and Keauhou Bay, 4 and 9 nautical miles south, respectively. The nearest protected harbor is at Kawaihae.

Navigation problem.—There is no adequate harbor along the Kona coast. There is a need for a protected harbor for existing and future recreational and commercial fishing craft.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement provides for an entrance channel 840 feet long and 120 feet wide, a main access channel 660 feet long and 120 feet wide, a service channel 200 feet long and 75 feet wide, wave absorbers on both sides of the entrance channel, and a wave trap.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1963).—

Federal	$680,000
Non-Federal	576,000
Total	1,256,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$27,000	$22,400	$49,400
Maintenance and operation	1,300	0	1,300
Aids to navigation	1,100	0	1,100
Total	29,400	22,400	51,800
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			24,200
Commercial fishing			7,300
Recreational fishing			104,100
Total			135,600

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain mooring facilities and utilities, including a public landing with suitable supply facilities open to all on equal terms, and depths in the mooring areas commensurate with depths in the related project areas; provide and maintain an adequate access roadway and all appropriate structures to insure a complete project including launching ramp, parking areas, and public restrooms; contribute in cash in a lump sum prior to commencement of construction 45 percent of the Federal first cost of construction, such contribution presently estimated at $556,000. Local interests have expressed complete accord with the plan of improvement and expressed willingness to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the Kona coast of the island of Hawaii is completely lacking in adequate harbor facilities for locally based recreation and fishing craft as well as transient boats. Large benefits will accrue to commercial and sport fishing and to recreational craft. The harbor will be a unit in a system of harbors of refuge for the Hawaiian Island chain. The improvements are well justified by the benefit-cost ratio of 2.6 to 1. Allocation of costs between the Federal Government and local interests is believed equitable because of the amount of local benefit.

HONOLULU HARBOR AND BARBERS POINT HARBOR, OAHU, HAWAII

(H. Doc. 93, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Honolulu Harbor is on the south coast of the island of Oahu. Barbers Point is about 16 miles due west of Honolulu Harbor.

Authority.—Resolutions of the House Committee on Public Works adopted August 14, 1959, July 19, 1956, and July 16, 1958; and 1950 River and Harbor Act.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for navigation at Honolulu Harbor consists of the Fort Armstrong Channel 40 feet deep, 500 feet wide, and 4,000 feet long; the Kalihi Channel 35 feet deep, 400 feet wide, and 10,300 feet long; a harbor area and interior channels 35 feet deep, and a double-leaf bascule bridge across Kalihi Channel. There is no Federal navigation project at Barbers Point. This is a privately developed barge harbor consisting of an entrance channel 22 feet deep, 220 feet wide, and 1,300 feet long, with an inner basin 21 feet deep, 520 feet wide, and 700 feet long.

Navigation problem.—The existing dimensions of Honolulu Harbor are inadequate for the larger vessels which could use this harbor if depths and channel widths were increased. The existing private harbor for barges at Barbers Point is inadequate for the anticipated commerce expected to be generated by the new industires in the area. A small-boat harbor also is needed in this area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—At Honolulu Harbor; deepen Fort Armstrong Channel to 45 feet; remove a narrow strip of land on the northeast corner of Sand Island; deepen the main harbor basin and Kapalama Channel to 40 feet; and widen Kapalama Channel by 60 feet along the Sand Island side. At Barbers Point: provide an entrance channel 42 feet deep, 450 feet wide, and 3,100 feet long; an inner basin 38 feet deep with an area of about 46 acres; a breakwater on the north side of the entrance channel; and an entrance channel 12 feet deep, 80 feet wide, and 1,200 feet long to a small-boat basin.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1963).—

	Honolulu Harbor	Barbers Point		Total
		Deep draft	Small boat	
Federal	$2,224,000	$7,643,000	$61,000	$9,928,000
Non-Federal	[1] 2,209,000	[2] 1,451,000	[3] 135,000	3,795,000
Total	4,433,000	9,094,000	196,000	13,723,000

[1] Includes cash contribution of $59,000.
[2] Includes cash contribution of $161,000
[3] Includes cash contribution of $63,000.

Project economics.—

	Honolulu Harbor	Barbers Point		Total
		Deep draft	Small boat	
Annual charges:				
Federal	$92,000	$320,900	$3,300	$416,200
Non-Federal	85,900	56,400	5,200	147,500
Total	177,900	377,300	8,500	563,700
Annual benefits:				
Transients savings	989,000	618,000	0	1,607,000
Commercial fishing	0	0	400	400
Recreation boating	0	0	87,700	87,700
Land enhancement	54,000	33,000	1,300	88,300
Total	1,043,000	651,000	89,400	1,783,400
Benefit-cost ratio	5.9	1.7	10.5	3.2

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash prior to construction 2.6 percent of first cost of construction of the general navigation facilities at Honolulu Harbor, 2.1 percent at Barbers Point deep-draft harbor, and 49.8 percent at Barbers Point small-boat harbor, such contributions being presently estimated at $59,000, $161,000 and $63,000, respectively. Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way. Hold and save the United States free from damages. Provide and maintain adequate terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms. Provide and maintain depths in berthing areas commensurate with project depths. Accomplish utility, drainage, and other relocations or alterations as necessary. Provide and maintain a suitable access road and necessary mooring facilities and utilities including a public landing at Barbers Point small-boat harbor open to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of the Navy: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Honolulu Harbor is the only deep-draft harbor on the island of Oahu, which contains 80 percent of the population of the State of Hawaii. The recent granting of a foreign trade zone charter to Hawaii by the U.S. Department of Commerce will result eventually in more and larger ships visiting the State. Increasing the existing dimensions of the harbor both in width and depth to accommodate the kinds of ships foreseen would maintain the industrial and commercial development of the islands. In the Barbers Point area, recent industrial development has been of such optimum growth that existing barge facilities have proven inadequate and constrictive. With the recommended improvements, Barbers Point Harbor could become the prime instrumentality for the establishment of a second major industrial and commercial complex in the State which would be of benefit to the economic health of the islands. The committee notes the high benefit-cost ratio and that the projects have all favorable reports. The projects are very important and desirable to the State of Hawaii.

INDIANA HARBOR, IND.

(H. Doc. 227, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Indiana Harbor is at the south end of Lake Michigan, 4.5 miles east of the State line between Illinois and Indiana.

Authority.—In partial response to similar resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committee of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives on May 18, 1956 and June 27, 1956, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for: a northerly breakwater 2,520 feet long and an easterly breakwater 3,807 feet long; an entrance channel from the lake about 800 feet wide, 29 feet deep at the outer end, and 28 feet deep at the inner end; an anchorage and maneuver basin in the outer harbor 28 feet deep; a canal entrance channel 290 feet wide and 27 feet deep; channels 260 feet wide and 22 feet deep in Indiana Harbor Canal to the Forks, and in Calumet River branch to 141st Street; a channel 160 feet wide and 22 feet deep in the Lake George branch from the Forks to White Oak Avenue; a turning basin 22 feet deep, lakeward of Canal Street and at the Forks; and maintenance of a channel 80 feet wide and 20 feet deep in Calumet River branch from 141st Street to Calumet River.

Navigation problem.—Lack of depth to accommodate vessels in Great Lakes fleet serving local docks.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a depth of 25 feet in the main canal from the landward end of the canal entrance channel for about 2,860 feet to a point lakeward of the Dickey Place Bridge, over a modified channel width of 190 feet except through the bridge openings.

Estimated cost (price level of May 1963).—

Federal	$96,000
Non-Federal	197,000
Total	293,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges: Interest and amortization	$3,800	$7,600	$11,400
Annual benefits: Transportation savings			507,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—44.0.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the improvement; provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas serving the terminals commensurate with the depth provided in the related project area; and accomplish without cost to the United States such relocations, as may be required, of submarine utility crossings. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the required cooperation for the proposed improvement.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Indiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress, subject to consideration of the recommendations made in its letter. The Bureau notes that the Secretary of the Army recommends that the authorization contain an additional item of local cooperation providing for assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they (local interests) will contribute one-half of the cost of construction dredging, currently estimated at $48,000. The estimated cost to the United States on this basis would be $48,000 for construction. The Bureau believes this to be a reasonable amount of special cost sharing in this project modification. Accordingly, it concurs in the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army. The Bureau considers, further, that if such cost sharing is not provided, construction of the project modification should not commence until there is convincing evidence that there will be additional beneficiaries from the project modification by the time construction is completed.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the Chief of Engineers recommends construction of the general navigation improvements at Federal expense and considers that the project should be authorized in accordance with his recommendation. The committee also notes the high benefit-cost ratio and the large cost to local interests.

JACKSONVILLE HARBOR

(H. Doc. 214, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Jacksonville Harbor is in northeast Florida, about 125 miles south of Savannah Harbor, Ga., and about 145 miles north of Canaveral Harbor, Fla.

Authority.—Resolution by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives adopted May 9, 1957.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for Jacksonville Harbor provides for: A channel 34 feet deep and 400 to 1,200 feet wide from the ocean to Commodore Point via a cutoff channel from St. Johns Bluff (Fulton) to Dame Point and via Terminal Channel to Commodore Point, and thence 30 feet deep to the Florida East Coast Railroad bridge, with increased width at the bends; maintenance of two jetties, 1,600 feet apart, built at the entrance under a previous project; construction of training walls and revetments; and a channel 30 feet deep and 750 to 1,100 feet wide along the northerly side of Blount Island. The bar channel was dredged 42 and 40 feet deep and 800 feet wide in 1951, and has been maintained to those dimensions with Navy funds. All depths are referred to local mean low water.

Navigation problem.—Existing channel depths restrict passage of deep-draft vessels to high tides and do not permit full loading of the larger tanks and cargo vessels; present channel depth and widths restrict safe and expeditious maneuvering of vessels.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Maintenance of the existing entrance channel at depths of 42 and 40 feet; deepening of the main ship channel to 38 feet upstream to mile 20; and widening of the channel by 100 feet near mile 5 and by 200 feet near mile 7.

Estimated cost (price level 1963).—

Federal	$8,484,000
Non-Federal	226,000
Total	8,710,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$331,000	$27,000	$358,000
Maintenance and operation	57,000		57,000
Navigation	2,000		2,000
Total	390,000	27,000	417,000
	General	Local	Total
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings	$797,000		$797,000
Land enhancement	22,000	$22,000	44,000
Total	819,000	22,000	841,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.0.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 2.6 percent of the contract price plus supervision and administration thereof for all items of work to be provided by the Corps of Engineers, an amount now estimated at $226,000 to be paid in a lump sum prior to start of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final allocation of cost to be made after the actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from any damages that may be attributed to construction and maintenance of the project; and, provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms, and depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depth provided in the related project areas.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection. However, if access facilities for hunting and fishing are incorporated in the project plan it is expected that their development would be undertaken in accord with the provisions of the proposed Water Project Recreation Act.

Remarks.—The committee notes that existing navigation channels in Jacksonville Harbor are inadequate to accommodate deep draft vessels except during periods of high tide and do not permit full loading of the larger tankers and cargo vessels. The improvements are well justified by the anticipated benefits.

JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, COLUMBIA RIVER, WASH. AND OREG.

(S. Doc. 28, 89th Cong.)

Proposed project modification for acquisition of additional lands for waterfowl management

Authority.—Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, approved August 12, 1958 (Public Law 85–624). The modification would provide for acquisition of fee title to certain lands for wildlife purposes which will require specific authorization by Congress.

Existing project.—The John Day lock and dam was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1950 as a major component of the plan for development of the lower Columbia River system for navigation and power. The dam will impound water 77 miles upstream. Construction of the authorized project was approximately 43 percent complete as of January 1, 1965.

Wildlife problem.—A study by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in cooperation with Oregon State Game Commission and Washington State Department of Game indicated that the John Day lock and dam project will destroy a portion of the habitat which is essential to a large segment of more than 7 million waterfowl utilizing the Pacific Flyway.

Recommended plan of improvements.—To modify the project by acquiring additional lands, contiguous to lands for other project purposes, for establising a waterfowl management unit. The total area proposed for development is estimated to be about 29,370 acres, of which about 16,790 acres would be water and 12,580 acres would be land. Besides project land amounting to 8,750 acres, an estimated 3,300 acres of private land and 530 acres of public lands will be required.

Estimated cost.—

	Federal
Corps of Engineers	$676,000
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	680,000
Total	1,356,000

The land will be purchased by the Corps of Engineers. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be responsible for development, operations and maintenance, including funding of these items.

Project economics.—

	Cost	Interest	Amortization	Total annual costs
Land purchase	$676,000	$17,745		$17,745
Development	680,000	17,850	$6,728	24,578
Operations and maintenance				66,000
Total	1,356,000	35,595	6,728	108,323
Annual benefits:				
Damages prevented				34,000
Enhancement				112,000
Total				146,000

Benefit-cost-ratio.—1.35.
Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
State of Oregon: Favorable.
State of Washington: Favorable.
Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.
Remarks.—The committee has considered the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, the director of the Game Commission, State of Oregon, and the director of the Department of Game, State of Washington, and the Chief of Engineers report on modifying the project for establishing a national wildlife refuge. The committee believes the refuge is desirable and that the modification should be authorized at this time.

KAWAIHAE HARBOR, HAWAII

(H. Doc. 75, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Kawaihae Harbor is on the northwest cost of the island of Hawaii, about 85 nautical miles northwest of Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, and about 150 nautical miles southeast of Honolulu Harbor on the island of Oahu.
Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolutions adopted March 17, 1960 and May 10, 1962. House Public Works Committee resolution adopted May 10, 1962. Section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of May 17, 1950.
Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for a 2,900-foot–long entrance channel 400 to 520 feet wide and 40 feet deep; a harbor basin 1,250 feet square and 35 feet deep; and a breakwater 2,650 feet long. Local interests have provided adequate terminal and transfer facilities and two harbors for small craft, one near the entrance and one at the inner end of the harbor.
Navigation problem.—The existing project was designed for use by vessels of the size which were expected to use the harbor. Since the project completion the primary users of the harbor have changed to the use of vessels which are 140 feet longer than those for which the project was designed. Present width of channel and size of harbor basin are inadequate for safe operation of the longer vessels except under the most favorable weather conditions. Surge within the basin interferes with loading and unloading operations, particularly at the barge wharf.
Recommended plan of improvement.—The proposed plan consists of widening the seaward 1,200 feet of the entrance channel, widening the harbor basin by 200 feet, lengthening the harbor by a maximum of 500 feet, extending the present breakwater by about 750 feet, constructing a wave absorber at the inner end of the deep draft harbor, and providing a small-boat harbor between the wave absorber and the inner end of the basin.
Estimated cost (price level of October 1963).—

Federal	$2,291,000
Non-Federal	46,000
Total	2,337,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$89,000	$1,800	$90,800
Maintenance and operation	7,000	0	7,000
Total	96,000	1,800	97,800
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			12,800
Transportation saving			161,300
Delay prevention			25,900
Land enhancement			4,800
Recreation			55,200
Total			260,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.7.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 0.6 and 46.3 percent of the first costs of construction of the general navigation facilities for the deep-draft and light-draft harbor improvements presently estimated at $14,000 and $26,000, respectively. Provide lands, easements, rights-of-way for construction and subsequent maintenance including spoil areas and necessary retaining measures or costs thereof. Hold and save the United States free from damages. Provide and maintain adequate public terminals and transfer facilities in the deep-draft harbor open to all on equal terms. Provide and maintain depths in berthing areas commensurate with project depths. Accomplish all relocations. Provide and maintain necessary mooring facilities and utilities including a public landing with suitable supply facilities in the light-draft harbor open to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The existing project will not permit safe use of the harbor by vessels of the length now in use by the primary users of the harbor. These vessels are some 140 feet longer than those for which the existing project was designed. Surge within the harbor basin interferes with loading and unloading operations. The proposed improvements will permit use of the harbor by the larger vessels, reduce surge within the harbor, and permit development of a small-boat harbor. The improvements are well justified by the overall benefits and the cash contribution by local interests is equitable because of the local recreational and land-fill benefits.

LEXINGTON HARBOR, MICH.

(H. Doc. 301, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The village of Lexington is on the southwesterly shore of Lake Huron, about 20 miles from the head of the St. Clair River at Port Huron.

Authority.—River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945. (Partial response.)

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal navigation project at Lexington. Local interests have constructed a fishing pier extend-

ing into water 5 feet deep. Timber piling, remains of old shipping piers, are along the waterfront south of the fishing pier.

Navigation problem.—There is a need for a protected harbor in this area for recreational boating, commercial fishing, and to serve as a harbor of refuge.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvements consisting of breakwaters totaling about 2,000 feet in length with recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater; an anchorage and maneuver area of about 6 acres, 8 feet deep; and a flared approach channel 10 feet deep, decreasing in width to 160 feet between the breakwaters.

Estimated cost (price level of May 1962).—

Federal	$563,000
Non-Federal	366,000
Total	929,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$22,100	$15,600	$37,700
Maintenance and dredging	8,000		8,000
Maintenance, navigational aids	400		400
Total	30,500	15,600	46,100
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating			33,200
Harbor of refuge			5,000
Commercial fishing			10,500
Fishing from pier			7,000
Total			55,700

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash, due to recreational boating benefits, 39 percent of the first cost of construction of the general navigation facilities and 50 percent of the first cost of structural modifications necessary to provide for recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater, such contributions presently estimated at $348,000 and $18,000, respectively, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and subsequent use, operation, and maintenance of the project; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities including an adequate public landing with provision for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants and potable water, and a parking lot with adequate sanitary facilities, open to all on equal terms; the dredging of berthing areas to be commensurate with the depth of the Federal improvement; establish a properly constituted and competent public body empowered to cooperate financially and to provide and

operate essential local facilities; and reserve spaces within the anchorage and mooring facilities adequate for the accommodation of transient craft. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection. However, the Bureau expects that, if the project is authorized by the Congress, the Chief of Engineers will assure himself that the benefits estimated to be realized from development of commercial fishing industry can be reasonably anticipated prior to the submission of any estimate of funds to construct the project.

Remarks.—The committee notes that there is a need for a protected harbor in this area and that the proposed project is economically justified.

Modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army.—Subject to the requirement that in lieu of contribution of 50 percent of the first cost of structural modifications necessary to provide for recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater local interests furnish, prior to construction, assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that, in accordance with the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, they will—

(*a*) Pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable cost of the structural modifications necessary to provide for recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater, less one-half of the cost of associated parking facilities to be provided locally, the amount involved currently being estimated at $11,000; and

(*b*) Bear all costs of maintenance and replacement of these modifications, the amount involved currently being estimated at $2,000 on an average annual basis.

Provided that the sizing and responsibility for development, maintenance, and replacement of these facilities may be modified in accordance with the alternatives provided in the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, depending on the intentions of non-Federal interests regarding participation in the costs of these features at the time of construction and subsequent thereto.

This modification would increase the estimated Federal cost from $563,000 to $570,000 and decrease the estimated non-Federal cost from $366,000 to $359,000. The Federal annual maintenance would decrease from $8,000 to $6,000 and the non-Federal annual maintenance would be $2,000.

Nothing in this modification is intended to alter the provision that improvement for navigation may be undertaken independently of the public recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater whenever funds for that purpose are available and the required local cooperation has been furnished.

MERMENTAU RIVER, LA.

(H. Doc. 239, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Mermentau River is formed by the junction of Bayous Nezpique and des Cannes about 2 miles above the town of Mermentau, 35 miles east of Lake Charles, La., and flows generally south for about 72 miles to the Gulf of Mexico.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Public Works Committee adopted June 7, 1961.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for removal of obstructions to navigation in the entire Mermentau River, the lower 25 miles of Bayou Nezpique, and lower 8.5 miles of Bayou des Cannes, and for a channel in the Mermentau River 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to the junction of the two bayous. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway provides shallow-draft channel connections to New Orleans and the Mississippi River on the east and the Texas gulf coast ports on the west.

Navigation problem.—There is a need for enlargement of the existing channel as necessary to afford the Mermentau River area the same accommodations for barge service as are available on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

Recommended plan of improvements.—Enlargement and realinement of the existing channel in the Mermentau River above the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to dimensions of 12 feet deep and 200 feet wide through Lake Arthur and 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide to the Interstate Highway No. 10 crossings of Bayous Nezpique and des Cannes, and replacement of the highway bridge at Lake Arthur.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1964).—

Federal	$2, 690, 000
Non-Federal	645, 000
Total	3, 335, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$107, 100	$25, 600	$132, 700
Maintenance and operation	22, 600	0	22, 600
Increased vehicular costs	0	3, 300	3, 300
Total	129, 700	28, 900	158, 600
Annual benefits: Saving in operating costs			259, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation, including suitable areas determined to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and subsequent maintenance; design and construct a replacement highway bridge at Lake Arthur having clearances of 50 feet vertically above high water and about 200 feet horizontally, and bear 17.1 percent of the cost of design and construction of the bridge by non-Federal

interests (exclusive of Corps of Engineers' costs), a sum currently estimated at $338,000, and maintain and operate the bridge after construction without cost to the United States; provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms, and depths in mooring areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in related project areas; and make all modifications to roads, bridges, pipelines, cables, and any other utilities (except the Lake Arthur highway bridge). Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Generally favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Louisiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee believes the existing project in the Mermentau River is an important tributary channel to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway so that the improvement recommended will provide benefits to the waterway commerce of the Nation.

CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, NORFOLK HARBOR, AND THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA.

(H. Doc. 187, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The southern end of Chesapeake Bay.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 15 1961.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for Norfolk Harbor provides in general for a main channel 40 feet deep and 1,500 feet wide from deep water in Hampton Roads to a point just south of the Hampton Roads Army Terminal piers; thence 40 feet deep and 750 feet wide to the mouth of Southern Branch of Elizabeth River; thence 40 feet deep and 450 feet wide up this branch to the Belt Line Railroad bridge, a total distance of 13.8 miles, including an approach and turning area of the same depth opposite the Norfolk Naval Shipyard; thence 35 feet deep, 375 feet wide and 1 mile long to the first Norfolk & Western Railway bridge; thence 35 feet deep, 250 feet wide, and 3.1 miles long to a turning basin of the same depth and 600 feet by 600 feet; for subsidiary channels in the Eastern and Western Branches and Scotts Creek; anchorage areas on the west side of the 40-foot channel opposite Lambert Point and south of Craney Island aggregating 173 acres, consisting of: 1 anchorage space 1,500 feet square and 38 feet deep; 1 anchorage space 1,500 feet square and 35 feet deep; and 1 anchorage space 1,000 feet wide, 3,000 feet long, and 20 feet deep; another anchorage of 45 acres, 12 feet deep, near Pinner Point; and a disposal area of about 2,500 acres adjacent to and north of Craney Island with appurtenant facilities.

A prior report, submitted to Congress April 7, 1965, recommends modification of the project for Norfolk Harbor to provide two anchorages at its junction with channel to Newport News and opposite

Sewells Point, 40 feet deep over swinging radii of 1,200 feet, and widening of the Newport News Channel from 600 to 800 feet.

Navigation problem.—The improvement of channel and anchorage facilities has not kept pace with the ports' increase in waterborne commerce and number of deep-draft commercial vessels that are being used.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for deepening Thimble Shoal Channel, channel to Newport News, and Norfolk Harbor Channel upstream to Lambert Point to a depth of 45 feet over channel widths as currently authorized, except that the Craney Island Reach of Norfolk Harbor Channel is to be widened from 750 feet to 800 feet, and the channel to Newport News is to be widened from 600 feet to 800 feet as recommended in a prior report; and deepening of four 40-foot anchorages, recommended in a previous report, to a depth of 45 feet with the easternmost anchorage at Sewells Point opposite the U.S. Naval Station, Norfolk, and the adjacent naval maneuvering area to be dredged initially; and the dredging of the three remaining anchorages (westernmost anchorage at Sewells Point and the two opposite Newport News) to be deferred until the need therefor develops; and extension of the existing 40-foot channel in Southern Branch upstream a distance of 1 mile to the Norfolk & Western Railway bridge; and provision of a turning basin in the Southern Branch opposite the mouth of St. Julian Creek.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1964).—

Federal	$25,600,000
Non-Federal	500,000
Total	26,100,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,171,300	$20,000	$1,191,300
Maintenance and operation	68,700	0	68,700
Total	1,240,000	20,000	1,260,000
Annual benefits:			
Elimination of damages and savings in time			10,000
Transportation savings			6,388,000
Total			6,398,000

Benefit-to-cost ratio.—5.1.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and subsequent maintenance of the improvements; accomplish without cost to the United States such alterations and relocations of sewer, water supply, drainage, and other utility facilities as may be required for construction of the project; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas and local access channels commensurate with depths provided in the related project areas. Local interests are willing and able to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau states that no incremental jusification is presented for the anchorages and that, although the report considers them to be inseparable from the proposed channel improvement, this contention is documented in only a most general way. The Bureau further states that should the recommended improvements be authorized by the Congress, it would expect that further consideration would be given to this matter prior to any request for funds to initiate construction of the anchorage areas.

Remarks.—The recommended improvements are necessary to better accommodate large bulk carriers and would have a significant and beneficial impact on coal shipments from the Hampton Roads ports at Norfolk and Newport News, Va. The committee recognize that the coal shipped from the Hampton Roads ports originates in the Appalachia depressed area. The committee also notes the excellent benefit-to-cost ratio and urges early construction of the project.

NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS

(H. Doc. 108, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Northeast corner of Staten Island, N.Y. Entrance to Kill Van Kull from upper New York Bay.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted March 30, 1955, and June 27, 1956.

Existing project.—Provides for a channel through lower New York Bay, Raritan Bay, Arthur Kill, lower Newark Bay, and Kill Van Kull to upper New York Bay, with depths of 37 feet in rock and 35 feet in soft material, with widths of 500 to 800 feet; two anchorages 38 feet deep; a dike north of Shooters Island; and two secondary channels of 30 feet deep and 400 feet wide, one south of Shooters Island and the other in Raritan Bay connecting with Raritan River.

Navigation problem.—Insufficient width of entrance channel to Kill Van Kull from upper New York Bay for the existing and prospective commerce.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for widening the entrance channel to Kill Van Kull from upper New York Bay to a width of 1,400 feet in the bay to a point near the intersection with the channel along the New Jersey pierhead line, thence narrowing to a minimum width of 1,000 feet to a point opposite the east end of Constable Hook, a distance of 1.1 miles, all to the presently authorized depths of 37 feet in rock and 35 feet in other material.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1963).—

Federal	$2,581,000
Non-Federal	0
Total	2,581,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$100,000	0	$100,000
Maintenance	20,000	0	20,000
Total	120,000	0	120,000
Annual benefits:			
Reduction in vessel damage			185,130
Reduction in transit time			48,790
Reduction in vessel delays			79,030
Total			312,950

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the recommended improvement, and for maintenance of aids to navigation, upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial disposal of spoil; and hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from the construction and maintenance of the improvement. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The proposed increase in the width of the entrance channel to Kill Van Kull from upper New York Bay will provide for safe and expeditious maneuvering of vessels using the entrance. The committee believes that the improvement is urgently needed.

NEW YORK HARBOR, N.Y. (ANCHORAGE AREAS)

(S. Doc. 17, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Atlantic Ocean and tributaries at the New York metropolitan area.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted July 16, 1957.

Existing project.—Provides for Ambrose Channel from the ocean through the Lower Bay to the Narrows, a distance of 10.2 miles, a width of 2,000 feet, and a depth of 45 feet below mean low water; for Anchorage Channel, a 5.7-mile extension of Ambrose Channel with the same depth and width from the Narrows through the anchorage grounds in the Upper Bay to the Hudson and East Rivers; for the southerly Entrance Channel and Bayside Channel from the ocean, east of Sandy Hook, to the junction with Main Ship Channel, a distance of 7.1 miles, a width of 800 feet and a depth of 35 feet below mean low water; for Main Ship Channel, from Bayside Channel to deep water in the Lower Bay, a distance of 5.3 miles, a width of 1,000 feet, and a depth of 30 feet below mean low water; for the removal of Craven Shoal to

a depth of 30 feet below mean low water; for a channel 2.3 miles long, 200 feet wide, and 16 feet deep at mean low water reaching from Bell Buoy 23 to Hoffman and Swinburne Islands; for an irregular, triangular-shaped anchorage area in the southerly half of Red Hook Flats with an area of about 442 acres and depths of 40 and 30 feet below mean low water; for an anchorage in the vicinity of Liberty (Bedloe) Island, with an area of about 160 acres and a depth of 20 feet at mean low water; and for a channel along New Jersey pierhead line connecting Kill Van Kull with deep water in Anchorage Channel at a point south of the Liberty Island anchorage, a distance of about 3 miles, a width of 500 feet, increasing to 800 feet at bends, and a depth of 20 feet at mean low water.

Navigation problem.—The increase in use of large tankers and dry-cargo vessels has resulted in serious congestion in the existing anchorage areas and accidents due to grounding and collisions.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for deepening the southern section of Anchorage 21B (Red Hook Flats) south of the fairway, for a width of about 2,000 feet over an area of 145 acres, from a depth of 30 and 40 feet below mean low water to 45 feet below mean low water; the middle section for a width of about 3,300 feet over an area of 187 acres, from a depth of 30 and 40 feet below mean low water to 40 feet below mean low water; and the northern section for a width of about 3,900 feet over an area of 150 acres, from a depth of 30 feet below mean low water to 35 feet below mean low water; enlarging and deepening Anchorage 21B (Red Hook Flats) north of the fairway, to an average width of 2,700 feet and extending the length to the Buttermilk Channel cutoff so as to encompass 446 acres, and deepening from a natural depth of 14 feet and more at mean low water to 35 feet below mean low water including the westerly 3,200 feet of the fairway; and deepening Anchorage 49C in Gravesend Bay for a width of about 2,300 feet over an area of 334 acres from a depth of 30 feet and more at mean low water to 47 feet at mean low water and changing its existing regulations to permit its use by commercial vessels and passenger liners when use of the anchorage by naval and military vessels will permit.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1963).—

Federal	$44, 852, 000
Non-Federal	----------
Total	44, 852, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal
Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$1, 748, 800
Maintenance	100, 000
Total	1, 848, 800
Annual benefits:	
Elimination of vessel damage	76, 000
Savings in transportation	2, 604, 000
Total	2, 680, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and maintenance of the project and for construction and maintenance of

aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers; hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from construction and maintenance of the project including submarine structures; and accomplish without cost to the United States removal or relocation of pipelines and other utilities, if necessary. Local interests are able and willing to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau notes that the expansion and improvement of anchorage areas recommended in this report are based upon projected growth in commerce from 1960 to 2015 and upon a significant increase in vessel size progressively over this period. The Bureau states that it would expect that prior to any request for funds for construction of this project, a suitable schedule would be developed to permit work on the various anchorage improvements to progress in phase with actual growth in harbor traffic and experienced trends in vessel design, and that thorough consideration would be given to use of hopper dredges as indicated by the Office of the Chief of Engineers.

Remarks.—The increase in the number of vessels as well as use of larger vessels have resulted in serious congestion in the existing anchorage areas. The committee believes the improvement is needed to care for the commerce in New York Harbor, one of the major ports of our Nation.

OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 76, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Oceanside Harbor is on the coast of southern California about 30 miles north of San Diego. It is situated adjacent to the Del Mar boat basin (Camp Pendleton) and within the city of Oceanside.

Authority.—Public Law 14, 79th Congress, approved, March 2, 1945.

Existing project.—There is no Federal project for general navigation. The Del Mar boat basin, developed by the Navy, consists of two jetties, and entrance channel, and an inner basin for military craft. Local interests constructed the Oceanside small-boat harbor in 1963 which consists of an approach channel 20 feet deep common to the Del Mar basin, and inner channels and a turning basin 10 to 20 feet deep, protected by a jetty, groin, and revetment. The Oceanside Harbor served as a source of material for the Federal beach erosion project at Oceanside which was completed in 1963.

Navigation problem.—The approach and entrance channels are subject to shoaling from upcoast and downcoast littoral drift. Local interests desire Federal maintenance of the general navigation facilities of Oceanside Harbor. The Navy has requested that maintenance of the approach and entrance channels to Del Mar boat basin be combined with the project for maintenance of Oceanside Harbor.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Federal maintenance of Oceanside Harbor at an estimated annual cost of $210,000 of which $10,000 would be for structural maintenance and $200,000 would be for maintenance dredging to be paid in equal apportionment form funds allotted to the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Navy.

Estimated cost (Oceanside Harbor only, if constructed as a Federal project, 1962–63 price level).—

Federal	$661,000
Non-Federal	759,000
Total	1,420,000

Project economics (Oceanside Harbor, if constructed as a Federal project).—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$25,900	$29,700	$55,600
Maintenance and operation	110,000	0	[1] 110,000
Total	135,900	29,700	165,600
Annual benefits: Recreational boating and fishing			257,800

[1] Excludes $100,000 for entrance channel to Del Mar Basin.

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide adequate service frontage and a public landing with suitable supply facilities, necessary mooring facilities, and utilities, access roads, parking areas, and related public-use shore facilities, open to all on equal terms; operate a general anchorage area and/or mooring facilities open to all on equal terms; secure and hold in the public interest all lands bordering the development to a width for proper functioning of the harbor; and be responsible for any maintenance required as a result of flooding from the San Luis Rey River over the flood control wall into the south harbor channel. Local interests have expressed willingness to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of the Navy: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the locally constructed harbor at Oceanside is adequate in size for the immediate needs of the local fleet of recreational craft; that the harbor has suitable depths for use by the U.S. Coast Guard vessels; that it will serve as a harbor of refuge; and that the improvements conform to high engineering standards of design and construction and are economically justified. The committee also notes that combining maintenance of the channels for the Navy's Del Mar boat basin with the channels for the Oceanside Harbor would reduce overall maintenance costs. The committee considers that Federal maintenance of the channels to the Del Mar boat basin and the general navigation features of Oceanside Harbor as a combined project is appropriate and warranted.

PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, ALA.

(S. Doc. 94, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Perdido Bay, a landlocked body of water, lies on the gulf coast about midway between Mobile Bay, Ala., and Pensacola Bay, Fla.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted March 26, 1960.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project.

Navigation problem.—Due to shallow depth, navigation through the pass is limited to drafts of 4 feet or less. Craft requiring greater depths use route through Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Pensacola Pass about 13 miles easterly. Channel hazardous for all types and sizes except during calm weather.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Perdido Bay, Ala., to provide for a channel 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide, stabilized by twin rubblemound jetties, from the Gulf of Mexico into Perdido Pass, thence 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide into Perdido Bay with a spur channel of the same dimensions leading into Terry Cove.

Estimated cost (price level of September (1963).—

Federal	$625,000
Non-Federal	481,000
Total	1,106,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$26,000	$20,000	$46,000
Maintenance	65,000	0	65,000
Maintenance aids to navigation	3,000	0	3,000
Total	94,000	20,000	114,000
Annual benefits:			
Shore protection			10,000
Recreational boating			113,000
Commercial fishing			31,000
Total			154,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 43 percent of the first cost of construction, such contribution presently estimated at $471,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor, or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance thereof, including erosion that might result

to adjacent shorelines and damages to shoreline bulkheads, wharves, piers, and bridges; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities including an adequate public landing or wharf with provision for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, available to all on equal terms; and maintain adequate terminal facilities, including berths and access channels, open to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Alabama: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the navigation channel in Perdido Pass is unsafe and inadequate to accommodate the recreational and commercial fishing craft based in the area. The proposed improvement would insure unrestricted navigation through the pass and provide for a safe dependable harbor of refuge. The improvement is needed and well justified by the anticipated benefits which are sufficiently local in nature to warrant the large cash contribution by local interests.

PONCE DE LEON INLET, FLA.

(H. Doc. 74, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Ponce de Leon Inlet is located on the northeastern coast of Florida about midway between St. Augustine and Canaveral Harbors.

Authority.—Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives on July 16, 1958.

Existing project.—No Federal project authorized. Dredged twice for U.S. Navy about 1943—once to 14 feet (860,000 cubic yards) and then to 16 feet depth (317,000 cubic yards). Both times serious shoaling occurred within about 1 year.

Navigation problem.—Rapid shoaling and shifting of the channel has resulted in loss of life and boat damage. A safe and stable channel is needed.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Ponce de Leon Inlet, Fla., for small craft navigation and beach improvement by provision of navigation channels across the ocean bar and through the inlet with depths and widths of 15 by 20 feet, 12 by 200 feet, and 12 by 100 feet, and thence southward 12 by 100 feet in Indian River North and northward 7 by 100 feet in Halifax River, both legs joining the Intracoastal Waterway; ocean jetties about 4,200 feet long and about 2,700 feet long on the north and south sides of the inlet, respectively; and sand bypassing facilities consisting of a notch or weir in the north jetty, an impoundment basin for littoral drift adjacent to the weir, and pumping by conventional pipeline dredge through a submerged discharge pipeline across the inlet.

Estimated cost (price level of February 1963).—

Federal	$1,104,000
Non-Federal	1,435,000
Total	2,539,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$43,700	$61,200	$104,900
Maintenance of project	123,900	53,600	177,500
Maintenance of navigation aids	1,400		1,400
Economic loss of land		7,400	7,400
Total	169,000	122,200	291,200
Annual benefits:			
Commercial fishing			56,000
Recreational boating			180,000
Beach improvement			129,000
Total			365,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 54.9 percent of the contract price plus supervision and administration thereof for all items of work to be provided by the Corps of Engineers, an amount presently estimated at $1,345,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to start of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final allocation of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined; contribute in cash $1,379,000 toward the cost of future maintenance and operation to be performed by the Corps of Engineers, that amount to be placed by local interests in escrow when required by the Chief of Engineers prior to start of construction and to be contributed upon completion of Corps of Engineers construction; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way and alterations to existing improvements required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor, or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages, including shore erosion damages, due to the construction and future maintenance of the works; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities including an adequate public landing or wharf with provisions for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, available to all on equal terms. Local interests are willing and able to comply with requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that rapid shoaling and shifting of the existing natural inlet results in loss of life and boat damage. Construction of a safe and stable channel would provide unrestricted navigation for the recreational and commercial fishing boats navigating the inlet. The sand bypassing feature of the project would result in substantial beach improvement benefits. The improvement

is needed and well justified by the anticipated benefits which are sufficiently local in nature to warrant a substantial local contribution.

PORT ORFORD, OREG.

(S. Doc. 62, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Port Orford is located on the Oregon coast 250 miles south of the Columbia River and 390 miles north of San Francisco.

Authority.—Resolution, Senate Committee on Public Works, adopted March 7, 1960.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project at Port Orford. Local interests have constructed a lumber and fish dock and a breakwater. The dock has been destroyed by storms and rebuilt four times.

Navigation problem.—Harbor is exposed to south and southwest storms which cause extensive damage to dock facilities and small boats and hamper vessel loading.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A 550-foot extension of the breakwater.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963).—

Federal	$696,000
Non-Federal	6,000
Total	702,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$28,100	$200	$28,300
Maintenance and operation	3,500	0	3,500
Navigation aids	2,500	0	2,500
Total	34,100	200	34,300
Annual benefits:			
Transportation saving			34,600
Damages prevented			16,300
Commercial fishing			10,500
Harbor of refuge			3,000
Recreational boating			900
Total			65,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.9.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 0.9 percent of the first cost of construction, presently estimated at $6,000, in a lump sum prior to construction; provide all lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain public terminal and transfer facilities, including suitable depths in berthing areas, open to all on equal terms. Local interests have expressed willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Oregon: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The harbor is an open roadstead protected from the north and west but exposed to storms from the southwest. Adequate depths are available to accommodate the existing and projected lumber

vessel traffic. The committee notes that local interests have expended considerable effort and funds in attempts to provide a protected harbor. The project will protect the harbor developments and permit shipping of lumber on a dependable schedule during winter months. The project will also eliminate the need for removing fishing vessels from the water during storms and will provide a harbor of refuge.

PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, R.I.

(S. Doc. 93, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Providence River is a tidal estuary extending northward from Narragansett Bay about 8 miles to the vicinity of Providence, R.I. The upper 2.5-mile section comprises the main harbor of Providence.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate, adopted January 6, 1950.

Existing project.—Existing Federal project provides for a channel 35 feet deep from North Point in Narragansett Bay to Fox Point in Providence Harbor, generally 600 feet wide for 8.1 miles, thence ranging up to 1,700 feet in width over the remaining 2.6 miles. A federally maintained channel, 16 feet deep and 50 to 230 feet wide in Seekonk River, extends from Red Bridge to Pawtucket, a distance of 3.4 miles. A Federal project, under construction in 1962, provides for a hurricane barrier across the estuary at Fox Point with a gated opening restricted to small-craft navigation.

Navigation problem.—Many of the larger vessels serving the harbor are subject to tidal delays or are restricted to partial loading, and the present channel is inadequate for entry by large tankers.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A channel 40 feet deep, generally 600 feet wide from deep water in Narragansett Bay just south of Prudence Island Light to the turn below Field Point at Providence and thence up to 1,700 feet wide to the existing project limit at Fox Point, with easing of bends to a minimum radius of 5,000 feet and excluding the marginal strip 75 feet wide channelward of the established harbor lines; and a channel 30 feet deep and 150 feet wide, extending northeastward from the upper end of the existing project to the vicinity of India Point at the mouth of the Seekonk River.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1962).—

Federal	$13,900,000
Non-Federal	
Total	[1] 13,900,000

[1] Includes $200,000 for the India Point Channel.

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$450,300
Maintenance and operation dredging	24,000
Maintenance and operation, navigation aids	2,900
Total	477,200
Annual benefits: Transportation savings	989,900

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the proj-

ect; and provide and maintain at local expense depths in berthing areas commensurate with those in related project areas. Local interests are willing to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Rhode Island: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau states that all projected benefits of the proposed Federal investment for India Point Channel would accrue to a single beneficiary, with no assurance that either the lands or the channel will be used by any shipper other than Tidewater within a reasonable period of time. The Bureau believes that requirements of local cooperation consistent with special, rather than general, benefits should be applied. It recommends that if the India Point Channel is authorized by the Congress conditions of authorization require that prior to expenditure of Federal construction funds, local interests agree to pay 50 percent of construction costs of the India Point Channel and that if such cost sharing is not provided, construction of the channel not commence until such time as there are additional users or the Secretary of the Army determines that there will be additional users within a reasonable period of time.

Remarks.—Many of the large vessels serving this area are subject to tidal delays or are restricted to partial loading. The committee considers the entire project to be a benefit to general navigation and worthy of construction at Federal expense.

ROCKY RIVER HARBOR, OHIO

(H. Doc. 352, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Rocky River Harbor is on the south shore of Lake Erie, in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, about 6.5 miles west of Cleveland Harbor and 21.5 miles east of Lorain.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee Resolution adopted June 3, 1959, and River and Harbor Act of 1945.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for Rocky River Harbor consists of an east entrance pier 900 feet in length and an entrance channel 100 feet wide and 10 feet deep, extending from that depth in Lake Erie to a point 600 feet inside the inner end of the entrance pier.

Navigation problem.—The natural channel in Rocky River is winding, irregular in width, and poorly defined. For lack of any other area of deep water within the harbor, large transient craft must anchor in or near the natural channel.

Recommended plan of improvement.—An anchorage basin of about 2 acres, 10 feet deep; realinement and upriver extension of the existing Federal channel for a distance of about 100 feet, 10 feet deep; thence a channel, 100 feet wide and about 1,700 feet long to a point near the railroad bridge, 8 feet deep; and thence a channel 60 feet wide and about 1,850 feet long to the public boat-launching facilities with suitable widening in the vicinity of the public dock and at the upstream end adjacent to the public boat-launching facilities, 6 feet deep in soft material and 7 feet deep in hard material.

Estimated cost (price level of February 1963).—

Federal	$235,000
Non-Federal	225,000
Total	460,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$9,400	$9,100	$18,500
Maintenance	10,000		10,000
Total	19,400	9,100	28,500
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating			86,800
Flood damages prevented			1,000
Total			87,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.1.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 49 percent of the first cost of construction due to recreational boating benefits, such contribution presently estimated at $225,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the project; establish a competent and properly constituted public body empowered to cooperate financially and to provide and operate essential local facilities including regulation of the use, growth, and free development of the harbor facilities with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, depths commensurate with the depths of the Federal channel improvements in service channels to principal docks and in berthing areas; and continue to maintain without cost to the United States the existing public dock and launching facilities open to all on equal terms. Local interests are willing to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Ohio: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The natural channel in Rocky River is winding, irregular in width, and poorly defined. The proposed project would increase vessel safety and maneuverability and permit greater use by the existing fleet. It is needed and well justified by the anticipated benefits. The required cash contribution by local interests is in accordance with existing policy.

SAGINAW RIVER, MICH.

Location.—On west shore of Lake Huron, head of Saginaw Bay, at Bay City, Mich.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives adopted April 14, 1964.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for an entrance channel 27 feet deep and 350 feet wide from deep water in Saginaw Bay to the river mouth, thence a channel 26 feet deep and 200 feet wide for about 0.4 mile, thence 25 feet deep and 200 feet wide to the Detroit & Mackinac Railway bridge in Bay City, thence 21 feet deep and 200 feet wide to a point 2,800 feet upstream from the Sixth Street bridge in Saginaw, thence 16½ feet deep and 200 feet wide to the upstream limit of the project at Green Point, a total distance of about 29 miles: and five turning basins varying in depths from 25 to 15 feet.

Navigation problem.—The existing project depth of 22 feet is inadequate to permit safe navigation by Navy ships now under construction at the Defoe Shipbuilding Co. located immediately downstream from the New York Central Railroad bridge. The deeper channel would also permit the use of larger vessels delivering limestone to a terminal in the reach under consideration.

Recommended plan of improvement.—That the existing project for Saginaw River, Mich., be modified to provide for deepening to 25 feet the reach of the channel in Bay City, Mich., extending from the upper end of the existing 25-foot project, immediately below the Detroit & Mackinac Railway bridge, upstream to the downstream side of the New York Central Railroad bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of March 1965).—

Federal	$437,000
Non-Federal	70,000
Total	507,900

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges: Interest and amortization	$17,500	$2,800	$20,300
Annual benefits: Transportation savings		35,800	

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for the construction and maintenance of the project upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvement; provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in dockside areas and approaches thereto commensurate with the depths provided in related project areas; and accomplish without cost to the United States such alterations to utility crossings and additional bridge pier protection as required because of

the improvement. Local interests are willing and able to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended improvement is fully justified and will meet an emergency situation created in part by the low levels of the Great Lakes.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, CALIFORNIA

(H. Doc. 208, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The deepwater navigation system under consideration extends for approximately 100 miles between an offshore bar in the Pacific Ocean near San Francisco and the inland port of Stockton, Calif.

Authority.—Six House Public Works Committee resolutions dated March 30, 1955; June 13, 1956; June 27, 1957 (two resolutions); August 15, 1961; and May 10, 1962.

Existing project.—The portions of existing projects for which modifications are proposed consist of (1) San Francisco Harbor (bar channel, 50 feet deep, 2,000 feet wide); (2) Richmond Harbor (approach channel and maneuvering area, 35 feet deep); (3) San Pablo Bay (channel 35 feet deep, 600 feet wide); (4) Suisun Bay (channel 35 and 30 feet deep, 300 feet wide); and (5) the San Joaquin River project (channels 30 feet deep and 400 and 225 feet wide.)

Navigation problem.—Primary difficulties result from inadequate depths. Vessels are required to light-load, lighter, and/or await high tides. A serious collision hazard exists in the narrow Suisun Bay Channel downstream of the naval ammunition depot at Port Chicago where the channel is traversed by both ammunition ships and supertankers. The route of the San Joaquin River project for a distance of about 15 miles is difficult to navigate particularly during periods of winter fog.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement would provide for modification of the five projects to provide depths of 55 feet for the San Francisco Bar Channel, 45 feet for the main internal bay channels upstream to the vicinity of Pittsburg, and 35 feet from Pittsburg to Stockton. It would provide for the enlargement and deepening to 45 feet of maneuvering areas adjacent to major petroleum refinery terminals along the channel route, widening the Suisun Bay Channel, providing access and turning basin facilities for a potential harbor in the vicinity of Antioch, constructing a cutoff route to Stockton through False River and across certain delta tracts, and constructing a new channel in upper San Francisco Bay leading through the west navigation opening in the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

Federal	[1] $46, 853, 000
Non-Federal	13, 692, 000
Total	60, 545, 000

[1] Net cost to Federal Government after reimbursement for recreation is $46,202,000.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,910,000	$596,000	$2,506,000
Maintenance and operation	1,413,000	252,000	1,665,000
Total	3,323,000	848,000	4,171,000
Annual benefits:			
General navigation			9,557,000
General recreation and fish and wildlife			480,000
Land enhancement			169,000
Total			10,206,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; provide all necessary spoil retention dikes; hold and save the United States free from damages; accomplish all utility modifications and relocations; provide and maintain necessary berthing areas at all terminals and wharves to be served by the deepened channels; construct a refinery and appurtenant wharves in the vicinity of Pittsburg; construct a deepwater port at Antioch; provide, maintain, and operate adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; in recognition of local land enhancement benefits which would result from land fill created by dredging spoil, contribute to the United States a sum presently estimated at $392,000; contribute one-half the separable cost allocated to recreation, a sum presently estimated at $651,000; maintain and operate public recreation areas; continue to maintain all existing flood control levees, including the works for wave-wash protection, and assume the maintenance of new or reconstructed flood control levees.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget notes that the Chief of Engineers recommends, in part, the enlargement and deepening to 45 feet of a maneuvering area adjacent to a refinery owned by the Standard Oil Co. of California. The Bureau notes that the only vessels requiring 45-foot depth in the maneuvering area are those utilizing Standard Oil's terminal facilities and believes that a question exists as to whether this segment of the project benefits more than a single user. If the project is authorized, the Bureau of the Budget would expect that further consideration would be given to this matter prior to any request for funds to initiate construction. If this segment of the project is authorized for construction, the Bureau of the Budget recommends that prior to expenditure of Federal construction funds, local interests agree to pay 50 percent of construction costs of the Standard Oil maneuvering area and that if such cost sharing is not provided, construction of the maneuvering area shall not commence until such time as there are additional users or the Secretary of the Army determines that there will be additional users within a reasonable period of time. Subject to consideration of these comments, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of the report to the Congress.

Recommendations of the Secretary of the Army.—After consideration of the report in the light of the comments of the Bureau of the Budget regarding the maneuvering area adjacent to the refinery owned by Standard Oil, the Secretary of the Army recommends the maneuvering area be authorized on condition that construction of this segment of the project not be initiated until compliance with a finding on the single beneficiary question by the Secretary of the Army, which finding may include a requirement that local interests contribute up to 50 percent of the cost of the required dredging.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the project is well justified by benefits estimated on the assumption that future tonnage movements would be about the same with no benefit estimated for possible increase in commodity tonnage movements due to the improved channels. The existing channels are inadequate for movement; a serious collision hazard exists in the narrow Suisun Bay Channel downstream of Port Chicago, the U.S. naval ammunition depot, where the channels are traversed by both ammunition ships and supertankers.

For additional remarks concerning this project, see "Committee Recommendations."

PORT SAN LUIS, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 148, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Port San Luis is located on the coast of southern California about 190 miles northwest of Los Angeles.

Authority.—Resolutions, Senate and House Committees on Public Works, adopted April 28, 1958, and July 16, 1958, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project, completed in 1913, provides for a breakwater 2,400 feet long.

Navigation problem.—Exposure to storms renders harbor unsafe for both deep- and shallow-draft vessels. Breakwater protection and removal of rock shoals needed for development of adequate moorage facilities for commercial and recreational craft.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for rehabilitation and a 1,500-foot extension of existing breakwater; construction of a detached breakwater 4,000 feet long; dredging an entrance channel 500 feet to 550 feet wide and 30 feet deep; a basin 400 feet wide, 1,300 feet long and 35 feet deep; a basin 400 by 400 feet and 15 feet deep; and an access channel 400 feet wide, 4,000 feet long and 15 to 20 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1961).—

Federal	$6,360,000
Non-Federal	1,550,000
Total	7,910,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$233,000	$72,000	$305,000
Maintenance and operation	67,000	0	67,000
Maintenance navigation aids	1,000	0	1,000
Total	301,000	72,000	373,000
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings			751,000
Increased fish catch			46,500
Fishing boat damages			20,000
Recreational boating and fishing			665,200
Total			1,482,700

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.0.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of the first cost of the detached breakwater, such contribution, presently estimated at $1,550,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction; provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; operate a general anchorage area for refuge open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain adequate public terminal facilities open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain depths in berthing areas commensurate with project depths; make necessary utility changes including removal of existing Port San Luis wharf; provide suitable marine repair facilities; provide necessary access road for construction of project. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Exposure to storms renders the harbor unsafe for both deep- and shallow-draft vessels. Breakwater protection and removal of rock shoals are needed to permit development of adequate moorage facilities for commercial and recreational craft. The committee notes the very high benefit-cost ratio and considers the project meritorious for Federal undertaking.

SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA.

(H. Doc. 226, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The harbor comprises the lower 21.3 miles of the Savannah River, which forms the boundary between Georgia and South Carolina.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted September 1, 1959.

Existing project.—Provides essentially for deep-water navigation channels ranging from 36-foot depth and 500-foot width at the ocean entrance to 30-foot depth and 200-foot width upstream, turning basins and anchorage basins of corresponding depths, channel enlargements as needed for maintenance, and training walls and jetties.

Navigation problem.—Existing channel depths restrict passage of deeper draft vessels to high tides and do not permit full loading of

the larger tankers and cargo vessels; present channel widths and limited turning areas restrict safe and expeditious maneuvering of vessels.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Channel 40 feet deep and 600 feet wide across the ocean bar and the entrance to Savannah Harbor, thence 38 feet deep and 500 to 400 feet wide to the vicinity of the Garden City terminal, thence 36 feet deep and 400 feet wide to the vicinity of the Savannah Sugar Refining Corp. terminal; with a turning basin at the Atlantic Coast Line terminal and enlargement of the existing basin near the American Oil Co. terminal, both 34 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level, 1961).—

Federal	$7,112,000
Non-Federal	208,600
Total	7,320,600

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$271,000	$8,000	$279,000
Maintenance and operation	130,000	36,000	166,000
Total	401,000	44,000	445,000
Annual benefits:			
Elimination of vessel delays			534,500
Savings in stevedore and demurrage expenses			25,800
Total			560,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the improvements; provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers; and provide and maintain at local expense depths in berthing areas commensurate with those in related project areas. Responsible local interests have indicated willingness to cooperate in the improvements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable, but urges that local interests acquire lands to replace lands to be used for spoil disposal in the Savannah National Wildlife Refuge. This matter will be coordinated with Interior during preconstruction planning stage.

State of Georgia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—As a result of inadequate channel depths in Savannah Harbor, many of the larger vessels serving the area are subject to tidal

delays or are restricted to partial loading. The committee notes the need for this improvement and that the benefits are ample to justify the project.

WEYMOUTH-FORE AND TOWN RIVERS, BOSTON HARBOR, MASS.

(H. Doc. 247, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Weymouth-Fore River is a coastal stream emptying into Hingham Bay on the south side of Boston Harbor, Mass. Town River, a small tributary, joins Weymouth-Fore River about 2 miles above its mouth.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Public Works Committee, adopted April 9, 1957.

Existing project.—The Federal navigation project for Weymouth-Fore River consists of a channel 32 feet deep in rock, 30 feet deep in other materials, and 500 feet wide from deep water, along the southerly half of the Boston Harbor Narrows channel in Nantasket Roads, through Nantasket (Hull) Gut, thence with the same depth and generally 300 feet wide across Hingham Bay and into Weymouth-Fore River to the Fore River Bridge, and continuing above the bridge to form a maneuvering basin 470 to 650 feet wide, and a channel generally 300 feet wide and 27 feet deep between Nut and Peddocks Islands; and for Town River consists of a channel 27 feet deep, and generally 250 feet wide, extending from its junction with Weymouth-Fore River to a point 1.3 miles upstream, with a turning basin 450 feet wide and 1,000 feet long at the inner end of the channel, and a channel 15 feet deep and 100 feet wide extending from the upstream limit of the 27-foot channel to a line just below the Quincy Electric Light & Power Co. substation.

Navigation problem.—Project channel dimensions are inadequate for existing deep-draft traffic and preclude use of the larger vessels which are being introduced into coastwide movement of commerce.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a channel 35 feet deep, 37 feet in rock, and 500 feet wide from deep water in Nantasket Roads, and along the southerly half of the Boston Harbor "Narrows" Channel, through Nantasket Gut, then 35 feet deep and 400 feet wide to the mouth of Weymouth-Fore River, then 35 feet deep, generally within the limits of the existing project, to the Weymouth-Fore River Bridge, and then 35 feet deep and generally 400 feet wide to the upper limit of the existing project; a channel 35 feet deep and 300 feet wide, increased from 400 to 550 feet at the bends, from the mouth of Town River to the existing turning basin in Town River; a 35-foot-deep turning and maneuvering basin at the confluence of the two rivers in King Cove; enlarging and deepening to 35 feet the existing turning basin in Town River; and 6 acres of 8-foot anchorage to compensate for that part of an existing local small-boat anchorage that would be usurped by widening of the 35-foot commercial channel. It also is recommended that the existing projects for Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Mass., be combined into a single project.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1962).—

Federal	$12, 500, 000
Non-Federal	1, 540, 000
Total	14, 040, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$382,200	$47,000	$429,200
Maintenance	35,400		35,400
Total	417,600	47,000	464,600
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings			1,493,900
Reduction in tugboat hire			98,100
Total			1,592,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide, without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction and subsequent maintenance of the project; make such alterations to sewer lines or other obstructive features as are necessary; and provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, depths commensurate with channel depth in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals, and maintain the enlargement of the small-boat anchorage. Local interests are willing to comply with the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The proposed improvement is amply justified and is necessary to permit the use of the larger vessels which are being used in coastal movement of commerce.

TRED AVON RIVER, MD.

(H. Doc. 225, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Tred Avon River is one of numerous tidal estuaries branching indirectly from Chesapeake Bay. It extends northeast about 10 miles from its confluence with the Choptank River, about 10 miles above the mouth of that stream, to Easton Point, about 1 miles below Easton, Md.

Authority.—Resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, on June 27, 1956, and June 23, 1964.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for a channel 8 feet deep and 150 feet wide, with widening at the entrance and at bends, from Peach Blossom Creek to Easton Point, with a turning basin of varying width at the mouth of the South Fork. The project also provides for a channel of the same depth and width and 2,100 feet long in the North Fork with a turning basin at the upper end.

Navigation problem.—Insufficient depths cause groundings and damages to the vessels. In addition, a considerable amount of time is lost waiting for favorable tidal conditions.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a channel 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide in Tred Avon River from that depth in the river near Peach Blossom Creek upstream to Easton Point, thence up North Fork about 1,400 feet at the same depth and width; and a turning basin in South Fork on the east side of the main channel at Easton Point 250 feet wide, 600 feet long, and 12 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1965).—

Federal	$323,000
Non-Federal	5,000
Total	328,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$12,960	$200	$13,160
Maintenance	6,000	250	6,250
Total	18,960	450	19,410
Annual benefits:			
Savings in vessel operating costs			29,100
Reduction in vessel damage			17,000
Reduction in lost time			13,600
Total			59,700

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.1.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor of the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project, including damages to oysterbeds; continue to maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; establish a competent and properly constituted public body to regulate the use, growth, and free development of the harbor facilities with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in the berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas. Local interests have indicated their willingness to comply with these terms.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Maryland: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes the substantial benefit-cost ratio and considers that the recommended improvements for navigation are urgently needed to serve this area of Maryland.

WEST HARBOR, OHIO

(H. Doc. 245, 88th Cong.)

Location.—West Harbor, Ohio, is on the southwestern shore of Lake Erie about 10 miles northwest of Sandusky, Ohio.

Authority.—River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal navigation project at West Harbor, Ohio. Local interests have dredged the east or "natural channel," about 2,000 feet long and 60 to 100 feet in width, to a depth of 4 feet. The west or Gem Beach channel, constructed by local interests and protected by steel sheet pile revetments, is about 1,000 feet long, 60 feet wide, and was originally 10 feet deep. Shoaling has reduced the depth to less than 5 feet.

Navigation problem.—Existing navigation facilities are inadequate for the large number of boats using the harbor. When sudden storms occur, many boats normally based at West Harbor are unable to enter the harbor safely because of the shallow depth and limited width available at the entrance.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Two arrowhead breakwaters having an aggregate length of approximately 2,450 feet, extending northeasterly into Lake Erie on either side of the natural entrance; an entrance channel between the breakwaters 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide to the mouth of the natural entrance where the width is reduced to 80 feet and the depth to 8 feet; and an access channel 80 feet wide and 8 feet deep from the innter entrance to a Y near the center of the harbor, a distance of about 4,300 feet, where the channel divides with one arm extending northerly about 3,100 feet and one southerly for about 2,300 feet.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1962).—

Federal	$544,000
Non-Federal	544,000
Total	1,088,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$21,100	$25,700	$46,800
Maintenance	5,000		5,000
Navigation aids	1,600		1,600
Total	27,700	25,700	53,400
Annual benefits;			
Recreational boats			111,000
Reduction in boat damage			5,000
Harbor of refuge			5,000
Land enhancement			2,000
Total			123,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.3.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of the first cost of construction of the general navigation facilities comprising the breakwaters, entrance channel, and access channels, due to recreational boating benefits, presently estimated at $544,000, to be paid in a lump-sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without

cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from the construction works and maintenance of the project; establish a competent and properly constituted public body empowered to cooperate financially and to regulate the use, growth, and free development of the harbor facilities with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain without cost to the United States an adequate public landing or wharf with provisions for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, available to all on equal terms; and provide and maintain depths commensurate with the depths of the Federal channel improvements in service channels to principal docks and in berthing areas. Local interests are willing to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Ohio: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Existing navigation facilities are inadequate for the large number of boats using the harbor. The proposed project would meet the needs of both locally based and cruising craft, and is economically justified. The committee notes that the required cash contribution by local interests is in accordance with existing policy.

CLIFF WALK, NEWPORT, R.I.

(H. Doc. 228, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Newport is located on Aquidneck Island near the mouth of Narragansett Bay about 25 miles south of Providence.

Authority.—Section 2, River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project.—No Federal.

Erosion problem.—Continued erosion and retreat of the cliffs and bluffs for many years has resulted in destruction and loss of segments of Cliff Walk at a number of locations.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of improvements for shore protection at Newport, R.I., extending from the west end of Newport Beach to the east end of Bailey Beach, a distance of about 18,000 feet, to consist of intermittent reaches of backfill, dumped riprap, stone mounds, stone slope revetment, stone breakwaters, concrete toe walls, concrete seawalls, concrete parapet walls, and grading and surfacing Cliff Walk and providing drainage therefor.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

Federal	$340,000
Non-Federal	810,000
Total	1,150,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$13,200	$31,500	$44,700
Maintenance	0	11,500	11,500
Total	13,200	43,000	56,200
Annual benefits:			
Recreational benefits			60,850
Prevention of loss of land and walk			11,800
Total			72,650

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Obtain and submit for approval suitable easements, leases, or other proof of the continued right of passage along the walk of the general public, and of satisfactory access, as may be needed, for construction and repair; and assure continued public ownership or control and its administration for public use during the economic life of the project; contribute 58.2 percent of the estimated first cost of construction of all shore structures for protection against erosion by waves and currents below the upper limit of computed wave runup and contribute 100 percent of the estimated first cost of restoration and filling of land, repair, construction, and drainage of the walk, and construction of those portions of shore structures above the limit of wave runup, an amount presently estimated at $810,000, the actual local contribution of first cost to be based on actual construction costs of the items of work involved in accordance with the above percentages; maintain, entirely at their own expense, those existing protective structures which are suitable for protection of the walk as indicated in the report of the division engineer; assure maintenance and repair of the walk and protective structures during the economic life of the project as may be required to serve the intended purpose; provide at their own expense all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including temporary access easements for construction; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works. Local interests have expressed that they will cooperate in the improvements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Rhode Island: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Restoring and stabilizing the shore at this location is essential to provide public use of this walk. The committee considers that the improvement is needed and is well justified by the anticipated benefits.

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.

(H. Doc. 325, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Atlantic City is located on the Atlantic Ocean, about 80 miles southwest of Sandy Hook and 45 miles northeast of Cape May.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—The existing project provides for the following protective works: (*a*) Inlet frontage: replacement of damaged concrete seawall at the city park by a steel sheet-pile wall; construction in three stages of a stone jetty about 4,800 feet in length on Brigantine Island (north side of Absecon Inlet); revetment of the Maine Avenue bulkhead; construction of two new stone groins (Caspian and Melrose Avenues) and extensions to six existing groins (Pacific, Euclid, northwest of Atlantic, Grammercy, Madison, and Adriatic Avenues) along Maine Avenue; restoration of about 3,800 feet of beach by placement of about 500,000 cubic yards of sandfill; and (*b*) ocean frontage: extension of the existing jetty at the south side of Absecon Inlet (at Oriental Avenue); construction of five new timber groins (St. Charles Place, Virginia Avenue, near North Carolina Avenue, St. James Place, and Illinois Avenue) and extension to existing stone groin (Vermont Avenue); restoration of about 6,000 feet of beach by placement of about 700,000 cubic yards of sandfill.

Beach erosion control problem.—To determine the effect of Public Law 826, 84th Congress, and the amendment thereto in section 103 of Public Law 874, 87th Congress, on the recommendations made for the existing project as contained in House Document No. 538, 81st Congress, 2d session. The existing project was adopted by the River and Harbor Act approved September 3, 1954, before the adoption of Public Law 826.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Federal participation in the amount of one-half of the costs of periodic nourishment for a period of 10 years, at an estimated average annual cost of $276,000 of which the Federal share would be $138,000; and that the same Federal participation apply on a reimbursable basis to the initial nourishment operation to be accomplished by local interests.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1962).—

	Initial nourishment	Periodic nourishment
Federal	$205,000	$138,000
Non-Federal	205,000	138,000
Total	410,000	276,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$100,000	$162,000	$262,000
Maintenance		270,000	270,000
Periodic nourishment	138,000	138,000	276,000
Total	238,000	570,000	808,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			144,000
Decrease in maintenance			8,000
Recreation			2,173,000
Total			2,325,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.0.

Local cooperation.—Continuation of conditions of local cooperation required for Federal participation in the existing project, but with Federal assistance in the costs of periodic and initial nourishment as recommended.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The recommended improvement provides for modification of the existing beach erosion project at Atlantic City to provide for Federal participation in periodic replenishment of beach fill for a period of 10 years. The committee notes that modification is in accordance with the policy established by Public Law 826, 84th Congress, and is amply justified.

CITY OF EVANSTON, ILL.

(H. Doc. 159, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Western shore of Lake Michigan immediately north of Chicago, Ill.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act 1930 (cooperative study provisions).

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for shore protection at Evanston, except for riprap protection at Grosse Pointe Park and at South Boulevard, was completed by local interests in 1960, with Federal participation in the construction costs. The improvements consist of steel sheet-pile groins and beach replenishment at three locations, Clark Street beach, Dempster Street beach, and Lee Street beach, and riprap protection downcoast of each of the groins.

Beach erosion problem.—Beaches at Grosse Pointe Park and South Boulevard are being eroded to the extent that the areas suitable for bathing are seriously reduced. There is need for additional recreational beaches in the area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Grosse Pointe Park: Impermeable sheet-pile groin 600 feet long, with sandfill placed on north side extending about 525 feet along the shore, varying in width from 300 feet at groin to 75 feet at north end. Total fill—33,000 cubic yards.

South Boulevard: Impermeable steel sheet-pile groin 600 feet long, with sandfill placed on north side extending about 800 feet along the shore, varying in width from 200 feet at the groin to 50 feet at the north end. Total fill—30,000 cubic yards.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964).—

	Grosse Point Park	South Boulevard	Total
Federal	$236,000	$156,000	$392,000
Non-Federal	100,000	156,000	256,000
Total	336,000	312,000	648,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Grosse Point Park:			
Interest and amortization	$9,200	$3,900	$13,100
Maintenance		4,700	4,700
Total	9,200	8,600	17,800
South Boulevard:			
Interest and amortization	6,100	6,100	12,200
Maintenance		9,400	9,400
Total	6,100	15,500	21,600

	Grosse Point Park	South Boulevard
Annual benefits:		
Damages prevented	$2,600	$4,300
Beach area added	42,600	28,400
Total	45,200	32,700
Benefit-cost ratio	2.5	1.5

Local cooperation.—Bear all costs of the work in excess of the recommended Federal contributions; provide without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; maintain during the economic life of the project continued public ownership and administration for public use of the publicly owned shores upon which the recommended Federal participation is based; maintain at the Grosse Point Park beach conditions that will exclude permanent human habitation including summer residences, preserve the natural protective features of the beach and inshore lands, and provide essentially full park facilities for appropriate public use including a suitable recreational beach all of which shall meet the approval of the Chief of Engineers; provide appurtenant facilities required for realization of recreational benefits; control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers; and obtain approval of the Chief of Engineers, prior to commencement of work, of detailed plans and specifications, and arrangements for prosecuting the work. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Restoring and stabilizing the beaches at these locations are essential to permit full use of the recreational potential of the area. The committee considers that authorization of this work is amply justified and warranted.

FORT PIERCE, FLA.

(H. Doc. 84, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The study area is located on a coastal barrier island fronting the Atlantic Ocean about 2 miles east of Fort Pierce, Fla., across Indian River.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project.—There is no Federal project for beach erosion control.

Problem.—The instability and recession of the shoreline due to deficiency of littoral material entering area and loss of material into offshore waters. The recession downcoast of the Federal navigation project jetties has accelerated since their construction by local interests in 1930.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Adoption of a project by the United States providing for reimbursement to the local cooperating agency of that part of the first costs of initial restoration and periodic nourishment for a period of 10 years of the two contiguous beaches as follows: One-half of such costs for that part of the reach of ocean shoreline starting at and extending 1.2 miles south of Fort Pierce Inlet which is in public ownership at the time of reimbursement; and 70 percent of such costs for the 0.1-mile ocean shoreline known as the Lions Club Park and located 6,310 feet south of Fort Pierce Inlet.

Estimated cost (price level of fall 1962).—

Federal	$220,000
Non-Federal	205,000
Total	425,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$8,600	$8,800	$17,400
Beach nourishment	37,200	34,800	72,000
Total	45,800	43,600	89,400
Annual benefits:			
Prevention of loss of land			53,700
Prevention of damage to developments			3,400
Recreational			62,700
Total			119,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Obtain approval by the Chief of Engineers, prior to commencement of work on the project, of the detailed plans and specifications for the project and of arrangements for prosecuting the work; furnish at their own expense all other lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project; and furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that, during the economic life of the project, they will: (1) Maintain continued public ownership of the publicly owned shores and their administration for public use during the economic life of the project, or assure continued availability for public use of privately owned

shores involved in the project where Federal aid is based on such use; (2) maintain at the Lions Club Beach Park conditions that will exclude permanent human habitation including summer residences, preserve the natural protective features of the beach and inshore lands, and provide essentially full park facilities for appropriate public use including a suitable recreational beach all of which shall meet with the approval of the Chief of Engineers; (3) provide periodic nourishment for preservation of the protective beach, as may be required to serve the intended purposes subject to Federal participation as recommended herein; and (4) control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to meet the terms of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Restoration and stabilization of the ocean shoreline in the vicinity of Fort Pierce are necessary for protection of public property, and to preserve the needed recreational beaches which have been reduced by erosion from storm waves and insufficient supply of natural beach material. The committee notes the provision of the project including periodic nourishment is urgently needed and is amply justified by the anticipated benefits.

HALEIWA BEACH, OAHU, HAWAII

(H. Doc. 107, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Haleiwa Beach is on the northwest coast of the island of Oahu, about 31 miles northwest of Honolulu.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930 (cooperative study provisions.)

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project for beach erosion control. Haleiwa Beach Park which fronts the beach is owned by the city and county of Honolulu.

Beach erosion control problem.—Haleiwa Beach has been deteriorating gradually.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Resotration and protection of the shore of Haleiwa Beach by artificial placement of beach fill and construction of an offshore breakwater and a groin.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1962).—

Federal	$572,400
Non-Federal	381,600
Total	954,000

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$37,900
Maintenance and periodic beach nourishment	10,900
Total	48,800
Annual benefits:	
Damages prevented	1,000
Recreation	186,100
Total	187,100

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.8.

Local cooperation.—Maintain the protective measures; maintain continued public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use; maintain at Haleiwa Beach Park conditions that will exclude permanent habitation including summer residences; preserve the natural protective features of the beach and inshore lands; provide essentially full park facilities for public use; and control water pollution to safeguard health of bathers. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee recognizes that Haleiwa Beach Park was at one time one of the finest recreational areas on the Island of Oahu, but because of wave action, it has deteriorated, and erosion is quite noticeable. The committee notes the high benefit-cost ratio and is convinced that this is a much needed project.

HUNTING ISLAND BEACH, S.C.

(H. Doc. 323, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Hunting Island is located along the southeastern shore of South Carolina in Beaufort County, 16 miles east of the city of Beaufort, 9 miles southwest of Edisto Beach, and 35 miles northeast of Tybee Roads at the mouth of the Savannah River.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project.

Beach erosion control problem.—The beach at the study area is eroding rapidly and existing improvements are being threatened and/or destroyed by encroachment of the ocean. The high-water line along the beach front has receded 100 to 500 feet since 1948.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan comprises periodic nourishment of about 18,500 feet of beach on the northern part of the island with initial placement of a 3-year advance nourishment, and construction of one groin at the north end of the island. Federal participation in periodic nourishment would be limited initially to a period of 10 years.

Estimated cost (price level of 1962).—

Federal	$319,000
Non-Federal	136,000
Total	455,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$12,000	$6,500	$18,500
Periodic nourishment	68,000	29,500	97,500
Total	80,000	36,000	116,000
Annual benefits:			
Land losses prevented			56,000
Damages prevented			12,000
Recreational			119,000
Total			187,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Contribute 30 percent of the first cost of the project construction, a sum currently estimated at $136,000, and agree that during the 10-year period following initial construction they also will contribute prior to the periodic nourishment work 30 percent of the costs thereof, a sum estimated at $29,500 annually; and furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that, during the economic life of these works, they will (1) provide, without cost to the Federal Government, all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction and nourishment of the project; (2) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages due to the construction and nourishment under the project; (3) control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers; (4) maintain for public use as a park and conservation area meeting the criteria for such areas as expressed in Public Law 87–874, the portion of the park upon which the Federal participation is based; and (5) assure maintenance and periodic nourishment of the project as may be required to serve the intended purpose, subject to Federal participation as recommended herein. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of South Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Restoration and stabilization of the rapidly eroding beaches at this location are necessary for the protection of public property and to maintain the existing recreation area. The committee notes that provision of the project consisting of beach fill and periodic nourishment is needed and amply justified.

PERTH AMBOY, N.J.

(H. Doc. 186, 89th Cong.)

Location.—City of Perth Amboy, Middlesex County, N.J.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project.—No Federal beach erosion project.

Beach erosion problem.—Consists of erosion of the beach in front of the existing seawall which will permit damage to property, including road and utility facilities and possible failure of sections of old bulkheads.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a 560-foot bulkhead.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964).—

Federal	$82,000
Non-Federal	82,000
Total	164,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$4,200	$4,200	$8,400
Maintenance		900	900
Total	4,200	5,100	9,300
Annual benefits:			
Shore protection			10,200
Enhancement			1,300
Total			11,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Bear all costs of the work in excess of the Federal contribution of $82,000; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; maintain during the economic life of the project continued public ownership and use of the present non-Federal publicly owned shores, and the private shores which are to be converted to public ownership, upon which the Federal participation is based; and obtain approval of the Chief of Engineers, prior to commencement of work, of detailed plans and specifications of the project.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The recommended improvement will alleviate future damage to the shore. The committee considers that the improvement is justified and authorization of the project is warranted.

WAIKIKI BEACH, OAHU, HAWAII

(H. Doc. 104, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Waikiki Beach is located in Honolulu on the south shore of the island of Oahu. The study area comprises a shore frontage of about 2¼ miles from Diamond Head to Ala Wai Yacht Harbor.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1940. (Cooperative study provisions.)

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for artificial placement of sand fill to widen the beach berm and construction of a terrace wall, two groins, and appurtenant drainage facilities. The State in 1957 built groins to assist in retaining sand fill.

Beach erosion control problem.—At one time a continuous beach existed along the shoreline. Usable beach area now exists only in

scattered locations. Seawalls built at the beginning of the century interfered with natural onshore-offshore movement of sand resulting in sand being washed seaward and to other areas. Groin construction and sand placement have been used in attempts to reduce erosion and improve the beach areas. Sone success has been obtained but the existing beaches are inadequate to meet public demand.

Recommended plan of improvement.—In lieu of existing project, provide for restoration and protection of the shore of Waikiki Beach by artificial placement of beach fill on the shore to widen the beach to widths of 75 to 180 feet, construction of eight new groins and appurtenant drainage facilities, and modification of three existing groins.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1963).—

Federal	$2, 490, 000
Non-Federal	[1] 1, 310, 000
Total	3, 800, 000

[1] Includes $500,000 for construction of Kuhio Beach segment by State.

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$145, 000
Maintenance and operation	46, 000
Total	191, 000
Annual benefits:	
Recreation	3, 179, 000
Reduction in maintenance	62, 000
Total	3, 241, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—17.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; obtain approval by the Chief of Engineers prior to construction of plans and specifications for the Kuhio Beach segment; provide a contribution estimated at $1,310,000 in funds or equivalent work, either prior to initiation of construction or in increments in accordance with the construction program satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers, subject to final adjustment based on public use and ownership of the shore at time of construction and after actual costs have been determined; maintain public ownership or continuous availability of unobstructed public use of the shores upon which the amount of Federal participation is based and administration of those shores for public use, exclusively for bathing and water-related recreation; maintain project works except for beach fill on the Fort DeRussy frontage; and control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—One of the primary attractions of tourism in Hawaii has been the unparalleled beauty and accessibility of its beaches. Waikiki Beach has long been one of these attractions; however, it has suffered from the natural action of the ocean waves and currents and only slowly diminishing patches of beach area are now found where

there once existed a ribbon of white sand. Hawaii was host to 500,000 tourists last year and it is anticipated that there will be 575,000 tourists this year. By 1970, it is expected that tourists will number 1 million and that income from the tourist business will probably be $500 million. It is believed that the extraordinarily high benefit-cost ratio, based on 1969 peak attendance estimates, may be even greater if peak estimates for 1970 were used. The committee considers the project to be highly justified and urgently needed.

SECTION 102

This section is similar to that in previous river and harbor acts. It provides for reimbursement of local interests for work done by them on beach erosion control measures authorized in this bill subsequent to initiation of the studies which form the basis for these measures, in accordance with the provisions of section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962. Certain restrictions and limitations are included to safeguard the interests of the United States. This section provides a reasonable basis for proceeding with necessary beach erosion control measures at time of need, so that costly beach restitution or irrevocable loss of beaches may be avoided. The provision has been considered equitable in previous legislation, and the committee considers that it also should apply to beach erosion control measures included in this bill.

SECTION 103—OBNOXIOUS WEEDS

This section proposes that a pilot project for the study and control of obnoxious aquatic plants in the Southeastern United States be extended to other parts of the Nation and continued beyond its scheduled expiration date. After careful consideration of this proposal the committee concluded that the results of the pilot project demonstrate the need for, and the practicability of, the nationwide and continuing program proposed by the bill. Such legislation would enable the Federal Government, with the cooperation of the States, to act quickly and effectively in preventing the spread of dangerous aquatic growths wherever and whenever they may gain a foothold in the United States, and to bring existing infestations under control. It would also make it possible to continue the research and experimental work essential to the development of more effective and more economic methods for dealing with such infestations.

The only serious question arising in the course of hearings on this legislation was whether the program authorized should be broad enough to cover the study and control of algae. The bill before the committee specifically named four marine algae: Ulva, Enteromorpha, Polysiphonia, and Gracilaria. In reporting on the bill the Department of the Army pointed out the close relationship between these growths and pollution problems. After considerable discussion of the problem the committee requested that representatives of the Corps of Engineers, the Public Health Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service reach a meeting of minds and report back to the committee. The Corps of Engineers subsequently informed the committee that general agreement had been reached that it would be undesirable to exclude algae from the kinds of plants that could be dealt with under the comprehensive and cooperative program contemplated by the pro-

posed legislation. The corps also pointed out that specific mention of Ulva, Enteromorpha, Polysiphonia, and Gracilaria in the legislation was unnecessary, since these and other algae could be dealt with, to the extent required, as the "other obnoxious aquatic plant growths," covered in the legislation. This is in accord with the recommendation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in its report on this legislation.

In view of the foregoing the committee has not made reference in this section to specific algae. The committee notes, however, that this is not to be interpreted as excluding algae problems from the purview of the legislation. But in deciding to leave the way open for a program encompassing such problems the committee is accepting the assurances of the agencies submitting views on the legislation that there will be effective coordination and cooperation in carrying out the proposed program. Finally, the committee states that it is not the intent of the legislation to in any way affect the legislative authorities under which existing Federal programs are being carried out.

SECTION 104

This section grants the consent of Congress for the purposes of section 9 of the act of March 3, 1899, to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pa., in the interest of small boat navigation and recreation. Plans for construction of the dam are required to be submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army. Enactment of this legislation will not result in any cost to the Federal Government.

SECTION 105

This section is similar to that in previous river and harbor acts providing for authorization of needed surveys at specifically named localities. It authorizes the Secretary of the Army to make survey investigations for navigation and allied purposes at the following named localities:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, N.H., and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Niagara River, N.Y., with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including con-

necting channels and harbors) and the St. Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than 2 years after funds are made available for the study.

SECTION 106

This section identifies title I of the bill as the River and Harbor Act of 1965.

Analysis of Title II

SECTION 201

This section is the same as that which has been included in the last several flood control acts. It continues the provisions of local cooperation which have been in effect for some time, and provides that project authorization shall expire if local cooperation is not forthcoming within 5 years after appropriate notification.

SECTION 202

This section is the same as that which has been included in the last several flood control acts. It continues the present procedure of submitting reports to the interested States and agencies prior to submission to Congress.

SECTION 203

This section summarizes the project authorizations for flood control, hurricane protection, and multiple-purpose works in title II. The initial table lists the projects, project document numbers, and estimated Federal costs. Pertinent information follows for each project.

Flood control

Project	Document No.[1]	Federal cost of new work
St. John River Basin: Dickey project and Lincoln school project, Maine.	H. 236, 89th Cong.	$227,000,000
Housatonic River Basin: Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers, Conn.	H. 324, 88th Cong.	5,100,000
New England-Atlantic coastal area: Westerly, R.I.	H. 85, 89th Cong.	3,287,000
Long Island Sound area: Stratford, Conn.	H. 292, 88th Cong.	4,340,000
New York-Atlantic coast area:		
East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, N.Y.	H. 215, 89th Cong.	32,620,000
Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, N.Y.	H. 181, 89th Cong.	6,230,000
Rahway River Basin: Rahway River, N.J.	H. 67, 89th Cong.	1,514,000
Neuse River Basin:		
Falls River Dam, Neuse River, N.C.	H. 175, 89th Cong.	18,600,000
New Bern and vicinity, North Carolina	H. 183, 89th Cong.	10,400,000
Middle Atlantic coastal area: Ocracoke Island, N.C.	H. 109, 89th Cong.	1,636,000
Flint River Basin: Flint River, Ga.	H. 567, 87th Cong.	88,653,000
Central and southern Florida:		
Hendry County, Fla.	H. 102, 88th Cong.	4,986,000
Southwest Dade County, Fla.	S. 20, 89th Cong.	4,903,000
South Atlantic coastal area: Biscayne Bay, Fla.	H. 213, 89th Cong.	1,954,000
Phillippi Creek Basin: Phillippi Creek, Fla.	H. 156, 89th Cong.	4,592,000
Lower Mississippi River Basin:		
Lower Mississippi River and tributaries	H. 308, 88th Cong. H. 319, 88th Cong.	181,109,100
Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana	H. 184, 89th Cong.	5,500,000
Morgan City and vicinity, Louisiana	H. 167, 89th Cong.	3,049,000
Lake Pontchartrain, La.	H. 231, 89th Cong.	56,922,000

[1] H. indicates House document; S. indicates Senate document.

Flood control—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal cost of new work
Ouachita River Basin: Monroe, La	H. 328, 88th Cong	$520,000
Red River Basin:		
Bayou Bodcau, Ark. and La	H. 203, 89th Cong	1,524,000
Caddo Dam and Reservoir, La	S. 39, 89th Cong	1,934,000
Gulf of Mexico:		
Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, Texas	H. 169, 89th Cong	1,800,000
Highland Bayou, Tex	H. 168, 89th Cong	3,500,000
Taylors Bayou, Tex	H. 206, 89th Cong	6,290,000
Rio Grande Basin: El Paso, Tex	H. 207, 89th Cong	12,943,000
Arkansas River Basin:		
Los Animas, Colo	H. 165, 89th Cong	1,541,000
Great Bend, Kans	H. 182, 89th Cong	4,030,000
John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand River, Kans	S. 27, 89th Cong	730,000
Walnut River, Kans	H. 232, 89th Cong	66,036,000
Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Okla	H. 242, 89th Cong	6,150,000
Missouri River Basin;		
Big Creek at Hays, Kans	S. 22, 89th Cong	2,702,000
Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska	H. 160, 89th Cong	1,524,000
Big Sioux River, Iowa and S. Dak	H. 199, 88th Cong	6,400,000
Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri.	H. 238, 89th Cong	9,167,000
Grand River and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri	H. 241, 89th Cong	278,635,000
Ohio River Basin:		
Chartiers Creek, Pa	H. 302, 88th Cong	12,207,000
Sandy Lick Creek, Du Bois, Pa	H. 185, 89th Cong	1,654,000
Wabash River and tributaries interim No. 2	H. 202, 89th Cong	72,900,000
Wabash River and tributaries interim No. 1	S. 29, 89th Cong	44,800,000
Devils Jumps Reservoir, Big South Fork of Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.	H. 175, 87th Cong	151,000,000
Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, W. Va	H. 243, 89th Cong	133,548,000
Big Sandy River, Ky., W. Va., and Va	H. —, 89th Cong	51,491,000
Martins Fork, Ky	H. —, 89th Cong	4,860,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin:		
East St. Louis and vicinity, Illinois	H. 329, 88th Cong	6,180,000
Kaskaskia River, Ill	H. 351, 88th Cong	3,498,000
Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Illinois	H. 150, 88th Cong	179,000
Iowa and Cedar Rivers at Waterloo and Marshalltown, Iowa	H. 166, 89th Cong	17,570,000
Zumbro River, Minn	H. 246, 88th Cong	975,000
Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak	H. 579, 87th Cong H. 193, 88th Cong.	3,885,000
Great Lakes Basin:		
Maumee River at Findley, Ohio	H. 158, 88th Cong	9,317,000
Chagrin River, Ohio	S. 35, 89th Cong	2,200,000
Grand River, Grandville, Mich	H. 157, 88th Cong	1,373,000
Little Colorado River Basin: Little Colorado River at Winslow, Ariz.	S. 63, 88th Cong	2,775,000
Gila River Basin:		
Indian Bend Wash, Ariz	H. 303, 88th Cong	7,250,000
Santa Rosa Wash, Ariz	H. 189, 89th Cong	6,430,000
Phoenix, Ariz	H. 216, 89th Cong	58,310,000
Eel River Basin: Eel River, Calif	H. 234, 89th Cong	13,732,000
Sacramento River Basin: Yuba River, Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Calif.	H. 180, 89th Cong	8,979,000
San Francisco Bay area:		
Sonoma Creek, Calif	H. 224, 89th Cong	9,400,000
Napa River, Calif	H. 222, 89th Cong	14,950,000
Whitewater River Basin: Tahquitz Creek, Calif	H. 223, 89th Cong	3,030,000
San Diego River Basin: San Diego River (Mission Valley), Calif	H. 212, 89th Cong	14,600,000
Columbia River Basin: Willow Creek, Oreg	H. 233, 89th Cong	6,680,000
Total, 64 projects		1,731,144,100

UPPER ST. JOHN RIVER HYDROELECTRIC POWER DEVELOPMENT, MAINE

Location.—The two dams which are included in the development would be located on the Upper St. John River in northern Maine at sites 289 and 300 miles above the mouth of the river.

Authority.—Report was prepared pursuant to letter from President Kennedy to the Secretary of the Interior dated May 20, 1961. In that letter the President requested the Secretary to advise him as to what changes in fuel, engineering, and financing costs might result in making the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project

economically feasible, and as to the advisability of hydroelectric power development on the Upper St. John River.

Flood problems.—Snowmelt, sometimes in combination with rainfall, annually produces spring floods along the St. John River. The area, being sparcely settled, has not been exposed to significant damages with the exception of Fort Kent located about 28 miles downstream of the Dickey Dam. The Fort Kent urban area has experienced seven consequential floods during a 36-year period of record. A recurrence of the flood of 1961 would cause damages of $450,000. With Dickey Dam in operation, impoundment of floodwaters would reduce discharges to well below the zero damage stage.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of the Dickey and Lincoln School projects on the Upper St. John River in Maine with hydroelectric power generating facilities. The Dickey Dam would be located above the confluence of the Allagash River in order to protect recreational resources of the stream.

Estimated cost (January 1964 price level).—

Federal	$227,000,000
Non-Federal	0
Total	227,000,000

Project economics.[1]—

Annual charges: Dickey-Lincoln School	$11,890,000
Annual benefits:	
Power:	
At site	20,531,000
Downstream (in Canada)	500,000
Flood control	40,000
Area redevelopment	409,000
Total	21,480,000

[1] As presented in report of Passamaquoddy-St. John River Study Committee, which was predicated on a transmission tie to Boston, Mass.

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.81.

Local cooperation.—None.

Remarks.—The committee notes that construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would be by the Corps of Engineers, and power marketing would be by the Department of the Interior in accordance with the recommendations in the report of the Passamaquoddy-St. John River Study Committee. The committee notes, furthermore, in the supplemental report of the Corps of Engineers that modification of the projects may be considered in the design stage. The committee is of the opinion that the authorizing language will permit such modifications as the Chief of Engineers may find to be desirable in the course of advanced engineering and design.

The committee also notes with approval the President's recommendation for a continued engineering and economic study of the Passamaquoddy tidal power project proposal, related extra-high-voltage transmission proposals and the proposed New England-Maritimes power grid by the Department of the Interior and other Federal departments and agencies.

HOUSATONIC RIVER: CONNECTICUT, MASSACHUSETTS, AND NEW YORK

(H. Doc. 324, 88th Cong.)

Location.—In the western part of Connecticut and the southwestern corner of Massachusetts with a small area extending into New York.

Authority.—Resolutions adopted by the Senate Public Works Committee on February 4, 1949, and September 14, 1955, and by the House Public Works Committee June 13, 1956 and July 23, 1956.

Existing project.—Flood control improvements consists of seven reservoirs and four local protection projects, all located in the Naugatuck River Basin. A navigation project for the lower part of the river which provides for a channel 18 feet deep and 200 feet wide for a distance of about 5 miles and 7 feet deep and 100 feet wide for a distance of an additional 8 miles.

Flood problem.—With the reservoirs constructed considerable damage would still occur at Danbury and Derby and local people desire flood protection.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Still River, Housatonic River Basin, at Danbury, Conn., for local flood protection by provision of channel improvement and appurtenant works; and improvement of the Housatonic and Naugatuck Rivers at Derby, Conn., for local flood protection by provision of floodwall, levee, channel improvement, a pumping plant, and appurtenant works.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963).—

	Danbury	Derby	Total
Federal	$2,300,000	$2,800,000	$5,100,000
Non-Federal	650,000	240,000	890,000
Total	2,950,000	3,040,000	5,990,000

Project economics.—

	Danbury		
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$75,000	$21,200	$96,200
Maintenance and operation		1,000	1,000
Total	75,000	22,200	97,200

	Derby		
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$91,300	$7,800	$99,100
Maintenance and operation		10,300	10,300
Total	91,300	18,100	109,400

	Danbury	Derby
Annual benefits: Damages prevented	$116,200	$210,900

Benefit-cost ratio.—Danbury, 1.2; Derby, 1.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project including lands for spoil disposal, storm water pondage, and collector ditches together with necessary changes to sewage systems, highway bridges and roads, railroad track except railroad bridges and approaches, and other utilities; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; prevent encroachment on improved channels and on ponding areas and if capacity of the latter is impaired, provide equally effective storage, pumping capacity, or both, without cost to the United States; and prevent encroachment within 20 feet of the top of the west bank of Naugatuck River at the proposed channel widening upstream from the highway bridge at Derby. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Connecticut: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—With the authorized improvements completed in the Naugatuck River Basin, considerable damage would still occur as a result of floods at Danbury and Derby. The committee notes that the proposed project is amply justified and the requirements of local cooperation are proper.

WESTERLY, R.I.

(H. Doc. 85, 89th Cong.)

Location.—About 45 miles southwest of Providence on the south shore of Rhode Island.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—No hurricane protection project. There is a cooperative beach erosion project at Misquamicut State Beach consisting of widening to an average of 150 feet for 3,250 feet. This project was completed in 1959.

Flood problem.—Serious problems of hurricane tidal flooding and beach erosion exist in Westerly. Three severe hurricanes that have struck the area since 1938 caused great loss of life and crippling damages to property. Hurricane Carol, 1954, caused tidal flood damages of about $3,900,000 in the Westerly area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of improvements for hurricane-tidal protection and beach erosion control for the Misquamicut area of Westerly, R.I., from Little Maschaug Pond to Weekapaug Point, in lieu of the presently authorized project, to consist of beach raising and widening to elevation 12 feet above mean sea level for approximately 3 miles of beach; low rock-faced dikes and revetment of dunes to form a backstop to elevation 16 feet above mean sea level; rock groins to stabilize the beach; gated control structure at Weekapaug inlet; road raising, Wawaloam Drive, Weekapaug; rock-faced dike west of Misquamicut community center extending from the shore dike to high ground, including a gated culvert; and

dredging in Winnapaug Pond to obtain a portion of the sand fill required for the above construction.

Estimated Cost (price level of 1963).—

Federal	$3,287,000
Non-Federal	1,663,000
Total	4,950,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$127,700	$64,600	$192,300
Maintenance		77,900	77,900
Total	127,700	142,500	270,200
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			199,300
Elimination of emergency costs			5,000
Reduction of land loss			14,700
Reduction of boat damage			2,000
Increase use of beach			242,800
Winnapaug Pond recreation			52,000
Fishing from groins			19,000
Total			534,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal, pondage, and borrow areas necessary for construction of the project, and recreation facilities on Winnapaug Pond, at a cost presently estimated at $380,000; accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations and relocation of sewerage and drainage facilities, buildings, utilities, highways, and other structures made necessary by the construction; bear 33.6 percent of the total first cost, a sum presently estimated at $1,663,000 to consist of the items listed above, and a cash contribution presently estimated at $1,283,000; to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction of the project; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army at an annual cost estimated at $95,000 initially and $78,000 after installation of the deferred groins; assure continued public ownership of public shore and public use of private shore upon which Federal participation in beach erosion control is based, and its administration for public use during the economic life of the project; and provide and maintain suitable facilities at public beaches to support the recreational development of the beaches; assure continued public ownership and use of recreation areas upon which Federal participation in recreation is based and provide and maintain suitable appurtenant facilities to the extent necessary for realization of evaluated benefits and their administration for public use during the economic life of the project; protect against encroachment that portion of Little Maschaug Pond included within the project in order that the water areas may be

available for storage of surface runoff; control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of the bathers; construct and maintain any bulkheads required for retention of dredged materials discharged to spoil-disposal areas from the initial construction; and at least annually inform the public and those affected that the improvements will not provide any substantial protection from ocean surges higher in elevation than that which occurred in September 1938. Local interests have indicated their willingness to furnish the necessary local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of Rhode Island: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the proposed improvements provide for hurricane protection and beach erosion control. It notes also that the cost sharing is in accordance with the established policy.

STRATFORD, CONN.

(H. Doc. 292, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The town of Stratford is located in Fairfield County, on the north shore of Long Island Sound, approximately 50 miles northeast of New York City.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing projects.—No hurricane protection project.

Flood problem.—About 2,400 acres within the town of Stratford are subject to hurricane tide floods. Residential, commercial, and recreational properties are subject to damages. Three severe hurricanes have struck the town within the past 24 years.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for diking around the greater part of the Great Meadows section of the town, varying in top elevation from 14 to 18 feet above mean sea level and extending about 3 miles from high ground at the Surf Avenue ramp to the Connecticut Turnpike to Oak Bluff Avenue at the western end of Lordship; a series of dikes and floodwalls along the Housatonic River, varying in top elevation from 14 to 18 feet above mean sea level, and extending about 2½ miles from high ground in the northern part of Lordship to high ground at the intersection of Broad Street and Housatonic Avenue; and appurtenant works including six highway crossing ramps, three ponding areas, four pumping stations, and five gated conduits.

Estimated cost (price level of 1962).—

Federal	$4,340,000
Non-Federal	1,860,000
Total	6,200,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$136.000	$63,000	$199.000
Maintenance and operation		23.000	23,000
Total	136,000	86,000	222,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			591,000
Elimination of emergency cost			12,000
Increased land utilization			31,000
Total			634,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way including borrow and spoil-disposal areas necessary for the construction of the project at costs presently estimated at $175,000; accomplish all changes, alterations, and relocations of buildings, highways, and utilities, and modifications to sewerage and drainage facilities made necessary by the construction of the project, at costs presently estimated at $90,000; bear 30 percent of the total first cost of the project, a sum presently estimated at $1,860,000 to consist of the items listed above and a cash contribution presently estimated at $1,595,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction or in installments prior so start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of costs to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and prevent any encroachment on the ponding areas which would decrease the effectiveness of the improvements and if ponding areas and capacities are impaired, promptly provide substitute storage capacity of equivalent pumping capacity. Local interests are willing to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Connecticut: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the proposed project is economically justified and that the improvement will provide adequate protection against tidal floods considered reasonably characteristic of the area. Cost sharing is in accordance with the established policy.

EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY, N.Y.

(H. Doc. 215, 89th Cong.)

Location.—West reach of south shore of Long Island and Jamaica Bay, N.Y.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955, and section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—Numerous groins have been constructed by local interests along the entire ocean front, and the United States has constructed a groin system at Fort Tilden. These groins have been generally effective in containing both the original beaches and the sand placed as artificial nourishment. During the past 40 years, local interests have deposited nearly 12 million cubic yards of sand along the ocean shore.

Flood problem.—Extensive damage has been inflicted to boats and property due to shore erosion and wave attack along this coastal area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A hurricane barrier, 4,530 feet long, across the entrance to Jamaica Bay with a 600-foot navigation opening and two 150-foot gates which would partially close the opening to 300 feet; dikes and levees, 1.2 miles long to high ground north from the barrier and dikes, levees, and floodwalls, 7.7 miles long, south and east from the barrier to and along the oceanfront to high ground at the eastern end of the Rockaway Peninsula; fill placement along the 6-mile ocean front floodwall with a berm 100 to 200 feet wide at 10 feet above mean sea level; stoplog structures, stairways, ramps, road raising, and other appurtenant works, including fishing platforms on the hurricane barrier; and Federal participation in the cost of periodic beach nourishment of the shore protection works for 10 years after completion of the initial beach fill, the Federal share presently estimated at 50 percent of such cost.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1963).—

Federal	$32, 620, 000
Non-Federal	20, 476, 000
Total	53, 096, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1, 234, 100	$577, 800	$1, 811, 900
Maintenance and operation and replacement		193, 100	193, 100
Periodic nourishment	240, 600	326, 400	567, 000
Total	1, 474, 700	1, 097, 300	2, 572, 000
Annual benefits:			
Shore protection			1, 410, 000
Hurricane protection			1, 925, 000
Barrier fishing			232, 000
Total			3, 567, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow areas, necessary for the construction of the project; accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations and relocations of buildings, streets, storm

drains, utilities, and other structures made necessary by the construction; bear 32 percent of the total first costs, a sum presently estimated at $16,976,000, consisting of $125,000 for items listed above, and a cash contribution of $16,851,000, provided that the cash contribution be paid either in a lump sum prior to commencement of construction, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; provide an additional cash contribution for the barrier, its gates and fishing platforms, equivalent to the present worth of the annual cost of maintenance, operation, and major replacements by the United States, an amount presently estimated at $3,500,000, subject to adjustment based on detailed design of project features, to be paid in a lump sum prior to inititation of construction; hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages that may arise before, during, or after prosecution of the work; maintain, during the economic life of the project, continued public ownership and use of the non-Federal publicly owned shores upon which the Federal participation in beach protection is based; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, except the barrier, its gates, and fishing platforms, and provide periodic nourishment during the economic life of the hurricane and shore protection works, as may be required to serve the intended purpose, subject to Federal participation in the cost of periodic nourishment of the shore protection works for an initial period of 10 years, as otherwise provided herein; control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers; and at least annually inform interests affected that the hurricane improvements will not provide substantial protection against hurricane and storm tide levels higher than about 3 feet above the elevation of Hurricane Donna of September 12, 1960. Local interests have indicated that they are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of New York: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to the submission of the proposed report to the Congress. However, the Bureau of the Budget notes that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers have recommended that field studies and hydraulic model investigations be conducted in connection with the final design of the project to determine the specific effects of the proposed hurricane barrier on water quality, fish and wildlife, and currents in Jamaica Bay. The Bureau of the Budget concurs in this recommendation and if the project is authorized by the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget would expect that a reevaluation of the benefits and costs reflecting the results of the model study would be made before funds are requested for initiation of construction of the project.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the maximum flood of record, which occurred in 1960, caused damages estimated at over $15 million. Under present and future conditions, the damages would be considerably more. The committee considers that the project is urgently needed.

STATEN ISLAND, FORT WADSWORTH TO ARTHUR KILL, N.Y.

(H. Doc. 181, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Coast of Staten Island, New York City, extending along lower New York and Raritan Bays from Fort Wadsworth at the narrows to Tottenville at the mouth of Arthur Kill.

Authority.—Section 2 of River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented; and Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—There are no existing or authorized Federal projects for hurricane protection or beach erosion control in the area.

Hurricane and beach erosion problems.—A serious erosion problem has resulted from storms of unusually severe intensity producing a reduction in the width of portions of the beach and exposing existing waterfront development to wave attack.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of the southeast shore of Staten Island from Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill for shore protection and prevention of hurricane tidal flooding by the following works: Graham Beach to Oakwood Beach, combined shore and hurricane protection consisting of 1.9 miles of beach fill and dune construction, 2.7 miles of levee, and four pumping stations; Great Kills Park, shore protection consisting of 0.9 mile of beach fill; Arbutus Lake to Seguine Point, shore protection consisting of 1.2 miles of beach fill and one stone groin; Federal participation in defraying the annual cost of periodic beach nourishment for the shore protection works in the reaches of Graham Beach to Oakwood Beach, Great Kills Park, and Arbutus Lake to Seguine Point, for a period not to exceed 10 years after the completion of the initial work in each reach, the Federal share presently estimated at 62 percent, 70 percent, and 41 percent, respectively, of such costs for the three reaches; Tottenville Beach, combined shore and hurricane protection consisting of 0.4 mile of beach fill and dunes, 0.2 mile of levee, and drainage facilities; and that the plans be considered sufficiently flexible to allow coordination with proposed highway or other developments.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1963).—

Federal	$6,230,000
Non-Federal	3,231,000
Total	9,461,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$197,100	$102,200	$299,300
Maintenance		48,800	48,800
Periodic beach nourishment	64,900	96,100	161,000
Total	262,000	247,100	509,100
Annual benefits:			
Hurricane protection			545,000
Shore protection			354,000
Total			899,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8 for overall project.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow areas necessary for construction of the project; accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations and relocations of buildings, streets, storm drains, utilities, and other structures made necessary by the construction; bear 34 percent of the total first cost, a sum presently estimated at $3,231,000 to consist of the items listed above and a cash contribution now estimated at $2,574,000 or, if any section is undertaken separately, the apportionment of the first cost will be as shown in the district engineer's report, with due regard to change in public ownership and other changes prior to construction, provided that the cash contribution be paid either in a lump sum prior to commencement of the entire project, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of costs to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and provide periodic nourishment during the economic life of the shore protection works as may be required to serve the intended purpose subject to Federal participation in the cost of periodic nourishment for an initial period of 10 years, as recommended herein, the non-Federal share of such costs for the 10-year period being presently estimated at 38 percent for the Graham Beach to Oakwood Beach reach, 30 percent for the Great Kills Park reach, and 59 percent for the Arbutus Lake to Seguine Point reach; maintain during the economic life of the project continued public ownership and administration for public use of the non-Federal publicly owned shores upon which the recommended Federal participation is based; adopt appropriate ordinances to provide for the preservation of the dunes; and control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers. Local interests are able and willing to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The proposed improvements provide for hurricane protection and beach erosion control. Local participation in the project was computed on the basis of the normal requirements for each purpose. The committee considers that authorization of this work is desirable.

RAHWAY RIVER, N.J.

(H. Doc. 67, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Rahway River Basin is in northeastern New Jersey within the Greater New York City metropolitan area.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate, adopted September 14, 1955, and item in Flood Control Act of 1948.

Existing project.—There are no existing Federal improvements for flood control in the basin. The town of West Orange and the city of Orange in cooperation with the Works Progress Administration built a walled channel and culverts on the East Branch at a cost of about $250,000. On both the main stream and tributaries, local interests have made numerous improvements including channel widening, deepening, and paving; wall construction; detention basins; and have established park areas in flood zones.

Flood problem.—Flooding on the Rahway River is an annual occurrence on the average. Floods can be either fluvial in the upstream reaches or tidal in the lower river, or both in rare instances. Recurrence of the highest floods of recent record would cause damages estimated at over $1,250,000. Over 50 percent of these damages would be incurred on the East Branch at South Orange.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Local flood protection works at South Orange on the East Branch of the Rahway River consisting of channel enlargement, construction of floodwalls, levees, a short flume section, reconstruction of four highway bridges with appurtenant road reconstruction and miscellaneous interior drainage facilities.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1961).—

Federal	$1,514,000
Non-Federal	493,000
Total	2,007,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$57,400	$18,700	$76,100
Maintenance and operation		3,000	3,000
Total	57,400	21,700	79,100
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			109,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make at their own expense all necessary changes to highways, highway bridges and approaches, utilities, and miscellaneous existing improvements; protect the channels and other flood control works from future encroachment or obstruction that would reduce their flood-carrying capacity; and control development of the fringe areas not protected by the proposed improvement with a view to preventing an undue increase in the flood damage potential. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of New Jersey: Favorable.

50-894—65——7

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the proposed improvements for flood control at South Orange, N.J., are economically justified and urgently needed.

NEUSE RIVER BASIN, N.C.

(H. Doc. 175, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Neuse River Basin, situated in the eastern part of North Carolina, is roughly oblong in shape, approximately 180 miles long, with a maximum width of about 46 miles. The Neuse River is formed by the confluence of the Eno and Flat Rivers, about 8 miles north of the city of Durham, and has a drainage area of approximately 5,700 square miles.

Authority.—Resolution of the House of Representatives adopted June 13, 1956.

Existing project.—The only existing flood control project of a permanent nature constructed on the Neuse River by the Corps of Engineers is the cutoff at Goldsboro. This project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, consists of a flood channel across two adjoining bends of the river.

Flood problem.—The Neuse River Basin is subject to frequent and destructive flooding. Major floods usually occur as a result of heavy rainfall from thunderstorms, hurricane and tropical storms. Flood damage occurring in the Neuse River Basin averages about $1,256,000 annually.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Recommend construction of the Falls Dam and Reservoir in the interest of flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation, and other purposes. Also, it is recommended that a general plan of improvement including 12 other reservoirs be approved as a guide for future development of the water and related land resources of the basin.

Estimated cost (1963 price level).—

Federal	[1] $18,600,000
Non-Federal	[2] [3]
Total	18,600,000

[1] Net cost to the United States, $16,245,000.
[2] Non-Federal interests to reimburse the United States for the entire construction cost allocated to water supply, currently estimated at $1,455,000.
[3] Non-Federal interests to bear ½ of the separable cost allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, currently estimated at $900,000.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$542,000	$72,000	$614,000
Maintenance, operation and replacement	75,000	45,000	120,000
Future recreation (discounted)		18,000	18,000
Economic cost of land	70,000	0	70,000
Total	687,000	135,000	822,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			564,000
Water supply			112,000
Low flow augmentation			195,000
General recreation			1,690,000
Fishing			171,000
Total			2,732,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.3.

Local cooperation.—Prevent encroachment on downstream channels; pay the United States for all costs allocated to water supply presently estimated at $1,455,000 for construction and $10,000 annually for operation, maintenance and replacements; and bear first cost and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, in accordance with current policy, presently estimated at $900,000 and $35,000, respectively. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable subject to further coordination of future recreation and fish and wildlife requirements prior to construction.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

State of North Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress subject to further consideration of questions raised by the Department of the Interior concerning (1) the proposed recreational development to meet the future needs of recreation; (2) lack of cost allocation data; and (3) the possibility that all Federal and non-Federal costs have not been included in the analysis.

Remarks.—The committee notes the urgency for construction of the Falls Dam and Reservoir as a key project in the development of water and related land resources of the basin. It will provide flood protection and water quality control in the Neuse Valley and much needed water supply for the city of Raleigh, N.C. The State of North Carolina requests early completion of this project and states its willingness to share in the cost of the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement features of the planned development. This committee notes that the project is well justified.

NEW BERN AND VICINITY, NORTH CAROLINA

(H. Doc. 183, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Neuse River drains about 5,700 square miles of eastern North Carolina. The Trent River, a tributary, joins the Neuse River at New Bern. At New Bern the Neuse River widens into a broad tidal estuary that empties into Pamlico Sound.

Authority.—Partial compliance with the authorization contained in Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, adopted June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal hurricane project in the area.

Flood problem.—Any sustained strong winds from the northeast quadrant on Pamilco Sound cause increased water levels in the Neuse River estuary with frequent damaging results in urban and other developed areas.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a hurricane-tidal barrier at the Cherry Point-Wilkinson Point site on Neuse River, N.C., to include an ungated navigation opening.

Estimated cost (1963 price level).—

Federal	$10,400,000
Non-Federal	4,460,000
Total	14,860,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$423,400	$181,500	$604,900
Maintenance and operation	500	25,000	25,500
Total	423,900	206,500	630,400
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented—present development			418,700
Damages prevented—future development			205,700
Recreation			24,400
Highway savings			27,100
Total			675,900

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—(*a*) Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project;

(*b*) Bear 30 percent of the total project cost, exclusive of aids to navigation, a sum presently estimated at $4,460,000, to consist of the items listed in subparagraph (*a*) above, and a cash contribution presently estimated at $4,448,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs and values have been determined;

(*c*) Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works;

(*d*) Maintain and operate all the works, after completion, exclusive of aids to navigation, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and

(*e*) At least annually notify those affected that the project will not provide substantial reductions in tide level greater in height than that which occurred during Hurricane Ione in September 1955. Local interests have indicated a willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of North Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau notes that economic justification of the project requires inclusion of incidental benefits of two kinds: (1) Presumed savings in the cost of building a bridge that the district engineer's report indicates is not now being seriously considered by the State highway commission; and (2) recreational

use of the barrier slope, for which no provision is apparently made for developing or maintaining access or supporting facilities.

Remarks.—The recommended improvements are necessary for protection of New Bern and vicinity against frequent damaging hurricanes that constantly threaten human life and property. The benefit-cost ratio of the improvements is 1.1.

OCRACOKE ISLAND, N.C.

(H. Doc. 109, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Ocracoke Island is a part of the North Carolina Outer Banks, separating Pamlico Sound from the Atlantic Ocean.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955; and section 2 of Public Law 520, 71st Congress, approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project.—No Federal beach erosion control or hurricane project.

Erosion problem.—Measures are needed to prevent shore erosion and to stabilize Hatteras Inlet due to storm-driven waves.

Recommended plan of improvement.—For protection of the ocean frontage from hurricane and erosion damage, a beach fill with a berm 50 feet wide at an elevation of 7 feet above mean sea level in front of a dike with a top width of 25 feet at an elevation of 11 feet above mean sea level, a feeder beach near the north end of the island, periodic nourishment for an initial period of 10 years, sand fences and vegetation; and for restoration and stabilization of the Ocracoke village frontage, beach fill to provide a berm with top elevation equal to that of the existing bank, but not exceeding 7 feet above mean sea level, vegetation and drainage facilities and periodic nourishment for an initial period of 10 years.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1962).—

Federal	$1,636,000
Non-Federal	232,000
Total	1,868,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$65,000	$9,200	$74,200
Maintenance and beach nourishment	192,300	9,700	202,000
Total	257,300	18,900	276,200
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			42,400
Beach recreation			311,200
Total			353,600

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Contribute the initial costs of protecting the privately owned portion of the sound shore of Ocracoke village, a sum presently estimated at $88,000; contribute 7.2 percent of the initial costs of the hurricane protection features presently estimated at $69,000 and the present worth of future maintenance thereof estimated

at $75,000 for a total of $144,000; provide all non-Federal lands, easements and rights-of-way including borrow areas, necessary for construction of the project; accomplish all relocations and alterations of sewerage and drainage facilities, buildings, streets, utilities, and other structures made necessary by the construction; and furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that during the economic life of the project they will: contribute the portion of the periodic nourishment and maintenance costs of the privately owned sound shore of Ocracoke village, a sum presently estimated at $9,700 annually; hold and save the United States free from claims for damages due to construction, nourishment, or maintenance of the projects, including the laying of dredge pipelines across the highways or across private property; and at least annually inform interests affected that the project will not prevent inundation or provide any substantial protection for ocean surges higher in elevation than those of the hurricane of September 14, 1944.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of North Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Most of the area is used as a national recreational area administered by the National Park Service. Visitation to the park has increased greatly since provision of an access bridge recently constructed. The project is economically justified with a benefit-cost ratio of 1.3. The committee considers the local contributions required for the work are fair and equitable and in accordance with existing policy for this type of project. Failure to provide protection for the area could result in irrevocable shore losses.

FLINT RIVER, GA.

(H. Doc. 567 87th Cong.)

Location.—Flint River rises 350 miles above its mouth and 1,000 feet above mean sea level in the southerly outskirts of Atlanta, Ga., the largest city in the Southeast. It crosses the fall line, marking the division of the Piedmont Plateau and the Coastal Plain, between river miles 230 and 285, falling 370 feet in 55 miles. It joins the Chattahoochee River to form the Apalachicola River, 108 miles above Apalachicola Bay, an arm of the Gulf of Mexico.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 1, 1948.

Existing project.—Local flood protection projects have been completed at Montezuma, Ga., and at Americus, Ga., under the general authority for small flood control projects. The authorized project, providing for multiple-purpose developments and supplemental channel work to give a channel depth of 9 feet and a minimum width of 100 feet in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee River upstream to Columbus, Ga., 268 miles, and 29 miles up the Flint River to Bainbridge, Ga., is in operation. Spewrell Bluff Reservoir on the Flint River, for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power; and allied purposes, was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 30, 1963.

Problem.—The power needs of the Flint River are increasing rapidly. Power from projects in the Flint River could be used in

power supply areas 23 and 24 as designated by the Federal Power Commission. Local interests desire extension of the navigation channel in the Flint River from Bainbridge to Albany and beyond. Annual flood damages below the fall line total $180,000, and productive values of farm and urban land would increase substantially if flood control were provided.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The comprehensive plan of water resource development consisting of five dams and reservoirs is recommended for general approval as a guide to the resource development of the Flint River Basin. The Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Reservoirs for hydroelectric power, flood control, general recreation, and fishing recreation are recommended to be authorized for construction. (Spewrell Bluff Reservoir also recommended in this report as the first step in the recommended plan was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 30, 1963.)

Estimated cost (price level of 1961).—

	Lazer Creek	Lower Auchumpkee	Total
Federal	$40,378,000	$48,275,000	$88,653,000
Non-Federal	650,000	1,020,000	1,670,000
Total	41,028,000	49,295,000	90,323,000

Project economics.—

	Lazer Creek	Lower Auchumpkee	Total
Annual charges:			
Federal	$2,158,000	$2,397,000	$4,555,000
Non-Federal [1]	70,000	112,000	182,000
Total	2,228,000	2,509,000	4,737,000
Annual benefits:			
Power	2,206,000	2,085,000	4,291,000
Flood control	82,000	380,000	462,000
General recreation	254,000	404,000	658,000
Fishing recreation	174,000	276,000	450,000
Navigation	9,000	15,000	24,000
Total	2,725,000	3,160,000	5,885,000
Benefit-cost ratios	1.2	1.3	1.2

[1] Non-Federal cost for recreational facilities.

Local cooperation.—Local interests shall agree to prevent encroachment on downstream channels that would interfere with the efficient operation of the proposed upstream reservoirs.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: No objection.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

State of Georgia: Favorable, but also desires authorization of navigation improvements.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau states that section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 requires that power pro-

duced at reservoir projects under control of the Department of the Army be sold at rates which will recover costs of power production and transmission, including capital investment allocated to power, over a reasonable period of years. The Bureau further states that as a matter of policy a period of 50 years has been considered appropriate for the recovery of power investment. Such a period was most recently affirmed by the Congress as a condition of the authorization of Laurel River Reservoir in the Flood Control Act of 1960.

Accordingly, the Bureau would expect that construction of the reservoirs, if authorized by the Congress, would not be undertaken until there is specific assurance that all cost allocated to power can be returned with interest within a period of 50 years.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended projects are economically justified and are desirable units in the overall plan of development of the Flint River Basin.

Modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army.—Subject to the additional requirement that prior to construction of Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee dams and reservoirs local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that, in accordance with the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, they will:

(a) Administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement;

(b) Pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable costs of the projects allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amounts involved currently being estimated at $850,000 for Lazer Creek Dam and Reservoir and $1,350,000 for Lower Auchumpkee Dam and Reservoir; and

(c) Bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amounts involved currently being estimated at $50,000 for Lazer Creek Dam and Reservoir and $79,000 for Lower Auchumpkee Dam and Reservoir, on an average annual basis.

Provided that the sizing and responsibility for development, operation, maintenance, and replacement of the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement features of the reservoirs may be modified in accordance with the alternatives provided in the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, depending upon the intentions of non-Federal interests regarding participation in the costs of these features at the time of reservoir construction and subsequent thereto, and that appropriate adjustments reflecting such modifications may be made in the allocation of costs to other project purposes.

This modification would reduce the estimated Federal costs from $40,378,000 to $39,528,000 for the Lazer Creek project; from $48,275,000 to $46,925,000 for the Lower Auchumpkee project and increase the estimated non-Federal costs from zero to $850,000 for Lazer Creek, and from zero to $1,350,000 for Lower Auchumpkee. The average annual cost of Federal operation, maintenance, and major replacement would be reduced from $312,000 to $262,000 for Lazer Creek; from $358,000 to $279,000 for Lower Auchumpkee and the non-Federal costs increased from zero to $50,000 for Lazer Creek and from zero to $79,000 for Lower Auchumpkee.

INTERIM REPORT ON HENDRY COUNTY WEST OF LEVEES 1, 2, AND 3, CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA PROJECT

(H. Doc. 102, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The area of Hendry County in this report is located in the south central portion of the Florida peninsula 10 miles southwest of Lake Okeechobee.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 9, 1960 (partial response).

Existing project.—The Federal project for the area was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 and provided for canals, levees, and water-control structures on the west and outside of the Everglades agricultural and conservation areas of the central and southern Florida flood control project. No work has been started on the Hendry County authorization. Levees and canals of the existing project forming the eastern border are completed.

Problem.—The flatlands of Hendry County in this area are flooded frequently because of poor drainage and prolonged rainfall. During recent years, notable major floods occurred in 1947, 1948, 1953, and 1960. A major flood such as that of 1947 covers nearly all of the 261-square-mile area. Most of the damage is to the agricultural lands immediately west of the levees of the existing project.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan provides that the existing project for central and southern Florida be modified and extended with respect to the authorized improvement on the west side of the Everglades agricultural and conservation areas in Hendry County, Fla., to provide the primary works for flood control and major drainage.

Estimated cost (price level of February 1962).—

Federal	$4,986,000
Non-Federal	[1] 1,567,000
Total	6,553,000

[1] Includes a cash contribution of 19.5 percent of contract price plus supervision and administration thereof.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$181,000	$109,000	$290,000
Maintenance and operation		71,000	71,000
Economic loss of productivity on lands		3,000	3,000
Total	181,000	183,000	364,000
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented			515,000
Increased land use			350,000
Total			865,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.4.

Local cooperation.—Local interests are required to contribute 19.5 percent of contract price plus supervision and administration, presently estimated at $1,159,000, to be paid prior to start of pertinent work units; construct and maintain associated lateral drainage facilities; provide all lands, easements and rights-of-way; make all bridge, road and utility relocations; hold and save the United States free from

damage; prevent encroachment on the channel; and maintain and operate the completed works.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: No objection.
Department of Agriculture: No objection.
Department of Commerce: No objection.
State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The recommended work constitutes a modification of certain canals, levees, and water control structures authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958, on which no work has been done. The modification is needed because the project as now authorized would not adequately serve the present needs of the area. The work is justified economically and its authorization is recommended as a necessary item in the overall central and southern Florida project.

SOUTHWEST DADE COUNTY, FLA.

(S. Doc. 20, 89th Cong.)

Location.—In central and southern Florida, southwest Dade County includes lands south of Tamiami Trail, west of levee 31, and east of the easterly boundary of Everglades National Park in Dade County, Fla.

Authority.—Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate on June 6, 1958.

Existing project.—Federal projects include: (*a*) Levee 29 forms the south boundary of conservation areas Nos. 3–A and 3–B and is the northern boundary of southwest Dade County area; (*b*) structure 12 in levee 29 releases floodwater from area 3–A into Everglades National Park just west of southwest Dade County area; (*c*) levee 67 extension is an authorized levee that will extend 8 miles along west boundary of southwest Dade County; and (*d*) levee 31(N) was authorized in 1948 and 10.8 miles have been completed along eastern edge of southwest Dade County area.

Flood problem.—Practically the entire area of 193 square miles is subject to flooding every year and lower lands are flooded throughout wet years. About 3,000 acres in the area are used on a seasonal basis for vegetable growing. Flood damage to present land use is estimated at $50,000 annually.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification and extension of existing project for central and southern Florida to provide:

Primary works: Canal and levee improvements, control structures, and pumping stations to provide outlets to serve existing and proposed associated drainage works by removal of the water ponded in the area during the wet season prior to planting time and limit ponding during a 1- in 10-year storm in the dry season to a few days.

Associated works: About 50 miles of secondary canals, small lateral canals, and tertiary works.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1963).—

Federal	$4, 903, 000
Non-Federal	4, 125, 000
Total	9, 028, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$189,100	$177,200	$366,300
Maintenance and operation	0	206,200	206,200
Economic loss on land	0	8,600	8,600
Associated works	0	98,300	98,300
Total	189,100	490,300	679,400
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			260,700
Increased land use			2,464,300
Total			2,725,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.0.

Local cooperation.—Local interests are required to contribute 46 percent of the sum of the contract price and the costs of supervision and administration and provide as their share of the initial costs of the primary improvements all needed lands and rights-of-way, including construction of new highway bridges, road changes, and alterations to miscellaneous utilities and other existing improvements; to hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; prohibit encroachment on the flood-carrying capacities of the improved channels; maintain and operate the improvements after completion; and construct and maintain the associated drainage works needed to realize the benefits made available by the proposed primary improvements. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that inadequate drainage in the southwest Dade County area results in frequent flood damages. The recommended improvements are amply justified. The committee considers the requirements for local contributions for the project are fair and equitable and in accordance with existing policy for projects of this nature.

BISCAYNE BAY, FLA.

(H. Doc. 213, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Biscayne Bay is located in the extreme southeastern part of Florida in Dade County. It extends southward about 28 miles from the north Dade County line southward, including Miami and Miami Beach areas to Cutler and Cape Florida.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—No hurricane project.

Flood problem.—All of the shore areas of Biscayne Bay are subject to storm-tidal flooding and wave damages. Within the study area there are about 15,000 acres at and below the 7-foot level and about 20,000 acres at and below the 10-foot level. These areas are occupied

for the most part by residences, apartments, motels, and hotels with a permanent population of about 220,000 in 1960. Indications are that land usage within these vulnerable areas will increase about 60 percent within 50 years. Historical records indicate that since 1830 about 194 tropical storms have threatened the Biscayne Bay area. However, detailed information on the effects of storms on the area is available only since 1925. Since that date, 14 hurricanes have affected the area, including 4 causing catastrophic effects. The most intense of these occurred in September 1926 when over 100 lives were lost. Total damages were estimated at the time at $76 million, of which about $40 million were from inundation and wave damage. Total inundation and wave losses since 1925 are estimated at about $70 million.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a stone- and asphalt-armored earthfill barrier connected to the mainland about 1 mile north of the Rickenbacker Causeway and extending eastward to Fishermans Channel adjacent to Fisher Island, a distance of about 3 miles. The structure would have an ungated opening for shallow-draft navigation at its intersection with the Intracoastal Waterway.

Estimated cost (price level 1962).—

Federal	$1,954,000
Non-Federal	837,000
Total	2,791,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$74,100	$31,800	$105,900
Maintenance and operation	0	7,600	7,600
Total	74,100	39,400	113,500
Annual benefits: Damages prevented (total)			2,150,00

Benefit-cost ratio.—19.0.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction and maintenance of the project at costs presently estimated at $181,000; bear 30 percent of the total first cost of the project, a sum presently estimated at $837,000 to consist of the cost of all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and a cash contribution presently estimated at $656,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, with the final apportionment of costs to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and maintain and operate the project works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. Local interests have indicated that they are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: No objection.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended improvements are necessary for protection of the Miami area against frequent damaging hurricanes that constantly threaten human life and property. The excellent benefit-cost ratio of 19.0 for the improvements is also noted. The committee considers the local contributions required for the work are fair and equitable and in accordance with existing policy for this type of project.

PHILLIPPI CREEK BASIN, FLA.

(H. Doc. 156, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Phillippi Creek Basin is in southwest peninsular Florida and is within Sarasota County except for a small fringe area in southern Manatee County.

Authority.—Flood Control Act of July 14, 1960.

Existing project.—There are no Corps of Engineers flood control projects in the Phillippi Creek Basin.

Flood problem.—Poor drainage and intense rainfall results in frequent flooding over much of the Phillippi Creek watershed. Thousands of acres of low valley and plain lands flood almost yearly. The 1962 flood covered about 8,000 acres of land. Principal damages occur to agriculture and urban development. Salinity intrusion is also a problem.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Phillippi Creek, Fla., to provide primary works for flood control and major drainage by enlargement of the main stream and its major tributary channels, realinement of the channel at U.S. Highway No. 41, and provision of spillway and inlet structures, and appurtenant works; all generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

Federal	$4,592,000
Non-Federal	3,263,000
Total	7,855,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$179,000	$140,000	$319,000
Economic loss on lands	16,500		16,500
Maintenance, operation and replacement		34,800	34,800
Associated costs		8,400	8,400
Total	195,500	183,200	378,700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			172,300
Increased land use			280,900
Recreational boating			22,000
Total			475,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 22 percent of the sum of the contract price and the costs of supervision and administration thereof for each part of the primary work to be provided by the Corps of Engineers, an amount presently estimated at $1,165,500, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to start of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final contribution to be determined after actual costs are known; construct and maintain the associated works needed to realize the benefits made available by the work to be provided by the United States (this requirement would not prohibit the assistance of other Federal and local conservation programs in constructing and/or maintaining lateral drainage works under authorizations not connected with this project); provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; provide without cost to the United States all necessary new highway bridges, alterations or replacement of bridges, roads, miscellaneous utilities, and other existing improvements, except railroad bridges and approaches; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; prevent encroachment on the flood-carrying capacity of the improved channels; and operate and maintain the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, except for the aids to navigation which would be maintained by the U.S. Coast Guard. Local interests are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee is cognizant of the local conditions in this area where inadequate drainage results in frequent flood damages. The recommended improvements are justified. The committee considers the requirements for local contributions for the project are fair and equitable and in accordance with existing policy for projects of this nature.

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES PROJECT

(H. Doc. 308, 88th Cong., and H. Doc. 319, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The area embraced by the Mississippi River and tributaries project extends from Cape Girardeau, Mo., to the Head of Passes, La., near the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about 1,000 river-miles. The project includes areas of the Mississippi River alluvial valley in the States of Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The area comprises about 35,000 square miles.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution, June 12, 1954, other resolutions of the Senate and House Public Works Committees, and the Flood Control Acts of July 24, 1946, and May 17, 1950.

Existing project.—Provides for improvements on the main stem of the Mississippi River from Cape Girardeau, Mo., to the Head of Passes, near the Gulf of Mexico, in Louisiana, by means of levees, channel improvement and bank stabilization, control structures, and floodways, and improvement of many tributary areas afforded flood protection by the levees. Project includes maintenance of a 12-foot navigation channel from Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La., which is to be obtained in connection with the channel improvement works, and four commercial harbors. In the tributary areas, improvements include five reservoirs, levees, channel improvements, water control structures, and pumping stations for flood control and drainage. Separable improvements of the project in the tributary basins are administratively subdivided into individual projects, referred to in the report as "features" of the comprehensive Mississippi River and tributaries project. The features are included in table No. 1 on page 8 of the Chief of Engineers' report to the Senate Public Works Committee in hearing on House Document 308, 88th Congress.

Recommended plan of improvement.—(*a*) Revetments to stabilize the riverbanks and protective works below Baton Rouge, La., to preserve the alinement of the Mississippi River below that point and protect the main stem levees from foreshore erosion.

(*b*) Levee improvements in the mainstem levee system and modification of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway. Levee improvements in the mainstem levee system consist of raising existing levees minor amounts at scattered locations to meet new flow lines and freeboard requirements established by the most recent storm and flood studies (1956). Modification of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway consists of raising the present grade of the fuse plug at Birds Point to 60 feet on the Cairo gage, putting the floodway into operation at 58 feet on that gage by artificially crevassing the levee when necessary, and enlarging the remainder of the Birds Point-New Madrid frontline levee to grades that will insure protection until the floodway is placed in operation.

(*c*) Improvement of the South Bank Arkansas River levees. These levees work in conjunction with the main stem levee system and the recommended work is of the same kind as that described for the main stem levee system above.

(*d*) Improvement of the South Bank Red River levees. These levees work in conjunction with the main stem levee system and the recommended work is of the same kind as that described for the main stem levee system above.

(*e*) Cairo-Mounds-Mound City area: Work consists of diversion channels at Mound City, necessary for the effective operation of the authorized Cache River pumping plant.

(*f*) St. Francis Basin: (1) Channel improvements for Locust Creek, Big Bay Ditch No. 1, Ditches Nos. 9 and 10 in Poinsett County, and Straight Slough ditch, Arkansas; Varney River, Mo.; and the Cockle Burr Slough-Buffalo Creek area, Arkansas and Missouri, and acquisition of lands for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses. (2) Improvements in the Big Lake Fish and Wildlife Refuge Area for fish and wildlife enhancement and flood control.

(*g*) Lower White River: Improvement of the existing local protection levee and associated drainage works at Clarendon, Ark., and channel improvements in the Big Creek Basin.

(*h*) Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon: Channel improvements in Mill and Vidal Bayous, La.

(*i*) Red River Backwater area: Construction of a pumping plant and acquisition of lands and development for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses.

(*j*) West Kentucky tributaries: Channel improvements in Obion Creek for flood control and drainage.

(*k*) Yazoo Headwater area: (1) Channel improvements in Alligator and Catfish Bayous, Bear Creek, and Whiteoak Bayou, and acquisition of lands and minor developments of mitigation of fish and wildlife losses. (2) Installation of water control structures in the Will M. Whittington Channel for fish and wildlife enhancement.

(*l*) Yazoo Backwater area: Water control structures in McCann Bayou for fish and wildlife enhancement.

(*m*) Big Sunflower River Basin: Water control structures for fish and wildlife ehnancement.

(*n*) Lower Mississippi River Delta region: Four salinity control structures for fish and wildlife enhancement.

Comprehensive review of the Mississippi River and tributaries project

[In thousands of dollars]

MAIN STEM FEATURES

Feature	Costs						
	Construction				Annual operation and maintenance		
	Purpose	Federal	Non-Federal	Total	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Channel improvement	(1)	145,219.0		145,219.0	3,000.0		3,000.0
Mississippi River levees (total)		2,165.0	5,000.0	7,165.0			
(a) General levee improvements	(1)	(1,325.0)		(1,325.0)			
(b) Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway	(2)	(840.0)	(5,000.0)	(5,840.0)			
South Bank Arkansas River levees	(1)	36.0		36.0			
South Bank Red River levees	(1)	584.4		584.4			
Total, main stem features		148,004.4	5,000.0	153,004.4	3,000.0		3,000.0

TRIBUTARY BASINS, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURES

Cairo-Mounds-Mound City	(3)	48.0	45.0	93.0		0.5	0.5
St. Francis Basin (total)		8,362.5	7,760.0	16,122.5			
(a) Channel improvements	(3)	(5,469.5)	(7,760.0)	(13,229.5)		84.0	84.0
(b) Lands in backwater area	(4)	(1,955.0)		(1,955.0)			
(c) Improvements, Big Lake area	(3)	(938.0)		(938.0)		13.5	[5] 13.5
Lower White River (tota)		7,950.0	1,900.0	9,850.0		100.0	100.0
(a) Clarendon levee	(3)	(178.0)	(23.0)	(201.0)		(1.7)	(1.7)
(b) Big Creek Basin	(3)	(7,772.0)	(1,877.0)	(9,649.0)		(98.3)	(98.3)
Boeuf-Tensas-Macon	(3)	350.0		350.0		6.0	6.0
Red River Backwater area (total)		7,000.0		7,000.0			
(a) Pumping plant	(3)	(6,568.0)		(6,568.0)		110.0	110.0
(b) Lands and development, Larto Lake-Jonesville and Sicily Island	(4)	(432.0)		(432.0)		15.8	15.8
West Kentucky tributaries (Obion Cr.)	(3)	1,906.0	824.0	2,730.0		18.0	18.0
Yazoo headwater area (total)		1,317.0		1,317.0	18.0		
(a) Channel improvements	(3)	(994.0)		(994.0)	(18.0)		18.0
(b) Lands and development, hillside floodway	(4)	(323.0)		(323.0)		4.9	4.9
Total tributaries, basins, flood control features		26,933.5	10,529.0	37,462.5	18.0	352.7	370.7

TRIBUTARY BASINS—SPECIFIC FISH AND WILDLIFE IMPROVEMENTS

St. Francis Basin (Big Lake area)	(6)	874.2	59.8	934.0	8.0		[5] 8.0
Yazoo headwater area (Will M. Whittington Channel)	(6)	47.5	47.5	95.0		1.2	1.2
Yazoo Backwater area (McCann Bayou)	(6)	44.0	44.0	88.0		8.0	8.0
Big Sunflower Basin	(6)	137.0	137.0	274.0		17.5	17.5
Lower Mississippi delta region	(6)	5,068.5	5,068.5	10,137.0		251.0	251.0
Total. tributary basins, Fish and Wildlife improvements		6,171.2	5,356.8	11,528.0	8.0	277.7	285.7
Grand total		181,109.1	20,885.8	201,994.9	3,026.0	630.4	3,656.4

[1] Flood control and navigation.
[2] Flood control.
[3] Flood control and drainage.
[4] Mitigation of fish and wildlife losses with costs charged to flood control.
[5] These Big Lake improvements serve both the flood control and fish and wildlife purposes. Total cost is $1,872,000, total maintenance $21,500 ($13,500 local for flood control and $8,000 Federal for fish and wildlife).
[6] Specifically for fish and wildlife enhancement.

Comprehensive review of the Mississippi River and tributaries project

[In thousands of dollars]

Feature	Federal annual costs	Non-Federal annual costs	Total annual costs	Annual benefits	Benefit-cost-ratio
MAIN STEM IMPROVEMENTS					
Channel improvement	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Mississippi River levees:					
(*a*) General levee improvements	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
(*b*) Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway	39.3	182.8	222.1	250.3	1.1
South Bank, Arkansas River levees	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
South Bank, Red River levees	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
TRIBUTARY BASINS—FLOOD CONTROL FEATURES					
Cairo-Mounds-Mound City	1.7	2.4	4.1	(2)	(2)
St. Francis Basin:					
(*a*) Channel improvements	195.1	414.8	609.9	1,627.0	2.7
(*b*) Lands in backwater area	70.0	----------	70.0	(3)	(3)
(*c*) Improvements in Big Lake area	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Lower White River:					
(*a*) Clarendon levee	6.3	2.7	9.0	(5)	(5)
(*b*) Big Creek Basin	274.0	181.8	455.8	793.2	1.7
Boeuf-Tensas-Macon	13.6	6.0	19.6	253.6	12.9
Red River backwater area:					
(*a*) Pumping plant	249.7	111.0	360.7	342.9	1.2
(*b*) Lands and developments, Larto Lake-Jonesville and Sicily Island	15.2	15.8	31.0	(3)	(3)
West Kentucky tributaries (Obion Creek)	67.3	53.1	120.4	(6)	(6)
Yazoo headwater area:					
(*a*) Channel improvements	35.1	18.0	53.1	114.4	2.2
(*b*) Lands and developments, Hillside Floodway	11.4	4.9	16.3	(3)	(3)
TRIBUTARY BASINS—SPECIFIC FISH AND WILDLIFE IMPROVEMENTS					
St. Francis Basin (Big Lake area)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Yazoo headwater area (Will M. Whittington Channel)	1.7	2.9	4.6	5.8	1.2
Yazoo backwater area (McCann Bayou)	1.6	7.4	9.0	16.5	1.8
Big Sunflower Basin (water control structures)	4.8	16.1	20.9	96.6	4.6
Lower Mississippi Delta region	179.0	430.0	609.0	932.3	1.5

[1] Main stem improvements: These features operate in conjunction with several other features to produce flood control, navigation, and other benefits. Total benefits are evaluated for comparison with the costs of all work completed and proposed. On this basis the benefit-cost ratio is 7.7 for all main stem features combined.

[2] Cairo-Mounds-Mound City: This improvement works in conjunction with the authorized Cache River pumping plant. The economic evaluation therefore must include both portions of work. The combined benefit-cost ratio is 2.1.

[3] Lands in backwater areas: This is a land purchase not chargeable to the work recommended for authorization, but to the entire features, both authorized and recommended for authorization. Its purpose is to mitigate fish and wildlife losses.

[4] Big Lake area: Improvements serve both flood control and fish and wildlife. Combined annual costs is $88,000 and includes operation and maintenance to be done by local interests at a cost of $13,500. Benefit-cost ratio is 1.2.

[5] Clarendon levee: Not susceptible of monetary economic evaluation; justified by need to preserve levee.

[6] West Kentucky tributaries (Obion Creek): Corps of Engineers project is economically inseparable from project of Department of Agriculture. Combined annual cost is $155,000, and combined benefits $185,700; benefit-cost ratio is 1.2.

Local cooperation.—Local cooperation requirements for the work recommended for authorization are as follows:

(*a*) Channel improvements and associated work below Baton Rouge: None.

(*b*) (1) General levee improvements in main stem levee system: Provide necessary rights-of-way and borrow areas in accordance with section 3 of the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, as amended by subsection (d) of the Flood Control Act of 1941 and section 10 of the act of December 22, 1944; and maintain completed works in accordance with section 3 of the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928.

(2) Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway: Provide modified flowage easements to permit operation of the floodway at 58 feet on the Cairo gage by artificial breaching of the levees; hold and save; maintain levees after completion in accordance with 1928 Flood Control Act as amended.

(*c*) South Bank Arkansas levees: Maintain completed works in accordance with 1928 Flood Control Act as amended.

(*d*) South Bank Red River levees: Maintain completed works in accordance with 1928 Flood Control Act as amended.

(*e*) Cairo-Mounds-Mound City Area: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works; provide interior drainage facilities for Mound City; provide street and highway culverts.

(*f*) St. Francis Basin: (1) Channel improvements: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works; make relocations of highway bridges.

(2) Big Lake area: Contribute 6.4 percent of the cost allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement, a contribution estimated at $59,800; hold and save; maintain flood control works.

(*g*) Lower White River: Clarendon, Ark.: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works. Big Creek: All the foregoing, and, in addition, make necessary improvements to highway bridges.

(*h*) Boeuf and Tensas River and Bayou Macon: Maintain works.

(*i*) Red River backwater area: Provide certain lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works.

(*j*) West Kentucky tributaries (Obion Creek): Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works; make alterations to highway bridges.

(*k*) Yazoo headwater area: Channel improvements for flood control: None. Fish and wildlife enhancement (Will M. Whittington Channel): Contribute half the cost of the improvement, a contribution estimated at $47,500; hold and save; maintain and operate works.

(*l*) Yazoo backwater area (McCann Bayou): Contribute half the cost of improvement, a contribution estimated at $44,000; hold and save; maintain and operate works.

(*m*) Big Sunflower Basin (water control structures): Contribute half the cost of improvement, a contribution estimated at $137,000; hold and save; maintain and operate works.

(*n*) Lower Mississippi River Delta region: Contribute half the cost of improvement a contribution estimated at $5,068,500; hold and save; maintain and operate works.

Comments of States and Federal agencies.—Note.—The report sent to the States and Federal agencies for comment was revised to include consideration of the comments. All State and Federal agencies concerned were sent copies of the revised report.

State of Illinois: Favorable.

State of Missouri: By letter dated July 28, 1961, Missouri concurred in report. However, report recommendations on local cooperation changed during processing of report because of change in administrative policy regarding cash contribution. Original recommendation involved transfer of responsibilities between Federal and non-Federal interests for authorized and recommended work. Revised recommendation left local cooperation

for authorized work unchanged and applied requirements of existing law and policy to works proposed for authorization. By letter dated June 12, 1964, the State recommended reverting to the local cooperation of the earlier version of the report.

State of Mississippi: Unfavorable. State urges further study be given to Yazoo backwater and Big Sunflower River features (review report on Big Sunflower now underway). Objects to procedures and criteria used in determining recommendations of improvements of the project in Mississippi. In a letter dated August 30, 1962, the State commented on the revised report and reaffirmed these objections.

State of Arkansas: Generally favorable, but believed local cooperation requirements were too severe. (These were changed in accordance with new policy, which does not require local contributions due to land enhancement benefits.) State also commented that improvements were needed to prevent seepage in lands along the Big Lake Floodway near the Rivervale culvert. (The Chief of Engineers believes the best solution to the problem is improvement of the Cockle Burr-Buffalo Creek area recommended in the report.)

State of Louisiana: Generally favorable, but states it is not necessarily in agreement with all details of the plan. Hopes local cash contribution for the Tensas-Cocodrie pumping plant will not be required. (The report was revised in accordance with present policy, which does not contain this requirement.) Requests reclassification of certain fish and wildlife improvements from the "enhancement" to "mitigation" measures category. (This was done in the revised report for several improvements, including those in Louisiana.)

Commonwealth of Kentucky: Favorable.

State of Tennessee: Generally favorable. Requests reclassification of certain fish and wildlife improvements from "enhancement" to "mitigation" measures category and inclusion in the Mississippi River and tributaries project of additional fish and wildlife improvements. (These reclassifications were made in the revised Chief of Engineers report.) Desires fish and wildlife improvements for Forked Deer and Obion Rivers which were not included in the report's recommendations. (Subject report does not recommend any improvements for authorization in Tennessee.)

Department of Interior: Requested reclassification in categories (mitigation, enhancement, etc.) of certain fish and wildlife improvements from the classifications presented in the original report. Also requested certain improvements in the Big Lake area of the St. Francis Basin in addition to those presented in the original report. (Report was revised to include these changes.)

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: No objection.

Federal Power Commission: No objection.

Department of Commerce: No objection.

Department of Agriculture: Recommends that before report is sent to Congress the Corps consult with the Soil Conservation Service to determine whether further main channel works (i.e., major drainage channels in tributary basins) should be recommended in report. Also recommends that provision be included

in report for close collaboration between the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers for orderly development of land and water resources. Points out differences in local cooperation requirement in recommended works; questions criteria used to determine eligibility of areas for Federal drainage projects; suggests joint consideration with the Corps to determine whether various improvements should be done by the Department under Public Law 566 or as a Corps program. (Chief of Engineers replied that in view of the advanced stage of processing the report to Congress, he believes inclusion of the letters of the Department of Agriculture and of the Corps of Engineers with the report should serve to indicate the mutual intent of the two agencies to cooperate in the matter.) (Changed conditions since H. Doc. 308, 88th Cong., studies are reflected in the updating of estimated project costs.)

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—

1. States that it would expect a reevaluation based on current price levels and conditions before funds are requested to initiate construction. (This has been done and reported to the Senate Public Works Committee in hearing, see table 1.)

2. (*a*) Recommends that improvements for fish and wildlife (listed in par. 67 of Chief's report) be made subject to provision that costs be divided equally between U.S. and non-Federal entities, except for Big Lake area, covered in (*b*) following. (The Secretary of the Army concurs with the Bureau of the Budget.)

(*b*) For Big Lake area, Budget recommends that non-Federal share determined as above be reduced to reflect benefits to existing Federal wildlife refuge adjacent to State area. (The Secretary of the Army concurs with the Bureau of the Budget.)

3. Recommends that acquisition of lands in Hillside Floodway area be authorized for fish and wildlife purposes. These were recommended in the Chief's report as a mitigation measure as part of the flood control project. (The Secretary of the Army concurs with the Bureau of the Budget.)

Remarks.—The committee notes that this report is the first comprehensive review of the Mississippi River and tributaries project in its entirety since authorization of the project in 1928. It believes that the works recommended for the main stem of the Mississippi River are necessary to preserve the integrity of main stem works, and that improvements recommended for the tributary areas protected by these works are necessary to keep pace with the expected growth of these areas. Recommended improvements for the enhancement of fish and wildlife are considered to be in keeping with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act as amended in 1958. The overall benefit-cost ratio of the entire project is recommended for modification is about 5 to 1, and each separable unit is incrementally justified.

In authorizing the improvements recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 308, 88th Congress, the committee has limited the monetary authorization made available by this act, to the new work recommended by the Chief of Engineers. The committee feels that this procedure will enable it to follow more closely the progress made on this project, resulting in a better overall understanding of the complexities involved. (Additional comments concerning this project are set forth in the committee recommendations.)

GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LOUISIANA

(H. Doc. 184, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Grand Isle sector of the Louisiana coast lies about 50 miles south of New Orleans and it includes a region of lowlands and marshes extending parallel to Bayou Lafourche extending about 70 miles inland.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—No Federal project for hurricane protection in the area. Local interests have constructed a ring levee at Golden Meadow, about 20 miles northwest of Grand Isle.

Flood problem.—The low land elevations, ranging from 2 to 4 feet on Grand Isle and the mainland as far inland as Golden Meadow increasing to about 8 feet in the vicinity of Larose, are subject to inundation and damage in the developed areas and agricultural lands.

Recommended plan of improvements.—Construction of a levee to protect the area adjacent to Bayou Lafourche extending about 19 miles between Golden Meadow and Larose, with floodgates at the two crossings of the Bayou Lafourche waterway, and gated drainage structures.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1960).—

Federal	$5,500,000
Non-Federal	2,357,000
Total	7,857,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$182,400	$81,300	$263,700
Maintenance, operation and replacement		29,800	29,800
Total	182,400	111,100	293,500
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			329,300
Land enhancement			52,200
Total			381,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow areas and spoil-disposal areas; make alterations to roads, pipelines, cables, wharves, oil wells, and any other facilities; bear 30 percent of the total project cost, a sum presently estimated at $2,357,000, to include the items above and a cash contribution presently estimated at $823,000, or equivalent work specifically undertaken as an integral part of the project after authorization and in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, hold and save the United States free from damages, maintain and operate, and prevent any encroachment on ponding areas unless substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity is provided promptly without cost to the United States. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Louisiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget noted that the benefits evaluated for the Golden Meadow-Larose protection levee may be overstated. The Bureau stated that land enhancement benefits appear to be in substantial part merely another measure of the value of flood damages to be prevented by the project and thus not fully creditable in assessing project feasibility. On the basis of information furnished by the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau commented that elimination of the benefits and evaluation of the project on current interest rates and prices would result in a benefit-cost ratio of 1.05. The Bureau recommends that prior to any request for funds for construction of the project the economic evaluation be reviewed and adjusted to eliminate any duplication in the calculation of flood control benefits. Subject to consideration of this recommendation the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the project is justified and finds the requirements of local cooperation to be in accord with previously authorized projects for protection against hurricane tides. However, it considers the indicated justification to be marginal and believes that a careful economic evaluation should be made prior to construction to insure the soundness of the project.

MORGAN CITY AND VICINITY, LOUISIANA

(H. Doc. 167, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Morgan City sector of the Louisiana coast lies in the lower Atchafalaya River Basin about 70 miles west from New Orleans. It includes a region of lowlands and marshes about 30 miles long containing numerous bayous, artificial canals, and lakes.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—A system of levees and appurtenant structures have been constructed to protect portions of the area from headwater floods from the Atchafalaya River.

Flood problem.—Some of the existing levees have been overtopped by hurricane tides and severe storm damages were experienced. Also, the remaining lowlands are inundated and suffer extensive damage to property during the periods of storm tides.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The construction of about 6 miles of new levees with appurtenant drainage structures for protection at Morgan City and the enlargement of 21.6 miles of existing levee and construction of 3.1 miles of new levee with necessary drainage facilities for an area of about 32,000 acres in the vicinity of Franklin.

Estimated cost (price level of May 1963).—

Federal	$3,049,000
Non-Federal	1,400,000
Total	4,449,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$97,400	$55,000	$152,400
Maintenance and operation		10,300	10,300
Total	97,400	65,300	162,700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented		$351,900	
Enhancement		59,400	
Total		411,300	

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.5.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction; make alterations to roads, pipelines, cables, wharves, drainage structures, and any other facilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; contribute in cash or equivalent work as estimated below, not less than 30 percent of the total project cost, said 30 percent to include the fair market value of lands and relocations and the remainder in cash or equivalent work specifically undertaken as an integral part of the project after authorization and in accordance with approved construction schedules, the final determinations to be made after construction is completed:

Area	Total contribution	Lands and relocations	Cash or equivalent work
Morgan City:			
Subarea A	$482,000	$482,000	None
Subarea B	35,000	35,000	None
Franklin and vicinity	883,000	635,000	$248,000

Provide all interior drainage and pumping plants required for reclamation and development of the protected areas; maintain and operate; and prevent encroachments on existing ponding areas unless substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity is provided promptly, without cost to the United States. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet the requirements of cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Louisiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The recommended plan will protect a large area and prevent sizable damages caused by tropical storms. The committee considers the proposed project well justified and the local cooperation to be in accord with previously authorized projects of this type.

LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA. AND VICINITY

(H. Doc. 231, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Lake Pontchartrain is in southeastern Louisiana north of and adjacent to the city of New Orleans.

Authority.—Section 6 of the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945. Resolutions of the Senate Public Works Committee adopted January 28, 1949, and February 4, 1957. Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—Federal improvements include: the east bank Mississippi River levee, the Bonnet Carre spillway guide levees, and the lakefront levee in Jefferson Parish; non-Federal improvements consist of: levees, seawalls, and railway embankment along the lakefront from the Jefferson-Orleans Parish line to South Point, thence to and along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, together with several cross levees, canals, and pumping systems for interior drainage; a levee for protection of the Chalmette area, with pumps and floodgates for interior drainage; and a seawall along the lakefront at Mandeville on the north shore.

Flood problem.—The existing protective works for developed areas surrounding Lake Pontchartrain have been overtopped during recent hurricanes causing extensive damages in residential and commercial areas.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a levee and floodwall barrier from the eastern end of the existing levees to high ground east of the Rigolets, construction of new or enlargement of existing levees along the south shore of Lake Pontchartain and the Intracoastal Waterway, construction of a new levee along the Gulf Outlet Channel for the Chalmette area, together with repair and reinforcement of the existing seawall at Mandeville, to prevent entry of lake surges into the developed areas. The barrier would include a lock and floodgates in the Rigolets, a navigation gate and floodgates in Chef Menteur Pass, and a multiple-purpose lock in the Inner Harbor Canal.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1961).—

	Hurricane protection	Seabrook lock	Total
Federal	$51,942,000	$4,980,000	$56,922,000
Non-Federal	[1] 27,904,000	0	[1] 27,904,000
Total	79,846,000	4,980,000	84,826,000

[1] Includes a cash contribution equivalent to the estimated capitalized value of operation and maintenance of the Rigolets navigation lock, presently estimated at $3,950,000.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,735,000	$1,004,000	$2,739,000
Maintenance and operation	125,000	244,000	369,000
Total	1,860,000	1,248,000	3,108,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			54,432,000
Land enhancement			729,000
Total			53,161,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—17.1.

Local cooperation.—For the hurricane protection plan: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow and spoil-disposal areas; make alterations and relocations to roads, railroads, pipelines, cables, wharves, drainage structures, and other facilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; bear 30 percent of the first cost, to consist of the fair market value of the items listed above and a cash contribution presently estimated at $18,028,000, or as a substitute for any part of the cash contribution, accomplish in accordance with approved construction schedules items of work of equivalent value as determined by the Chief of Engineers; provide an additional cash contribution equivalent to the estimated capitalized value of operation and maintenance of the Rigolets navigation lock and channel to be undertaken by the United States, presently estimated at $3,950,000; provide all interior drainage and pumping plants required for reclamation and development of the protected areas; maintain and operate the project, except the Rigolets navigation lock and channel and the modified dual-purpose Seabrook lock; and acquire adequate easements or interest in land to prevent encroachment on existing ponding areas unless substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity is provided promptly.

For the Seabrook lock: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow and spoil-disposal areas; and hold and save the United States free from damages. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Could not concur because of a conflict between proposed levee location and the interstate highway construction program. The Chief of Engineers understands that the final design and location for Interstate Highway No. 10 have been approved recently. The highway would be carried on a trestle at an elevation that would clear the existing levee on the west side of Jefferson Parish and that would clear the proposed levee on the St. Charles Parish side of the borrow pit ditch. It is believed on this basis that the apparent conflict between the hurricane protection plan and the highway no longer exists.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Louisiana.—Requested reconsideration of the non-Federal share of the project first cost and the operation and

maintenance cost for the Rigolets locks because of the large past expenditures by local interests to provide protection and because the State believed the locks at the Rigolets were not an essential part of the hurricane protection plan but necessary only for navigation. The Chief of Engineers indicated to the State that Federal policy, as set forth in recent congressional authorizations for hurricane protection projects, provides that local interests bear not less than 30 percent of the construction cost of the new work which shall include credit for the lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations normally provided by non-Federal interests. When the fair value of the lands, etc., is less than 30 percent of the cost of construction, the difference shall be borne by non-Federal interests as a cash contribution or in equivalent work after project authorization. It is the opinion of the Chief of Engineers that in the absence of the hurricane protection barrier there would be no necessity for the Rigolets lock. The lock is viewed as an integral part of the hurricane protection plan to preserve the existing navigation between the Gulf of Mexico and Lake Pontchartrain with the costs of construction and operation and maintenance chargeable to the protection plan. However, since the need for the specific added feature is related to navigation, it is believed that performance of the operation and maintenance by the Federal Government subject to local repayment thereof, would be in the public interest.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget observed that the Seabrook lock was needed as much for the mitigation of the adverse effects resulting from construction of the Mississippi River-gulf outlet channel as for hurricane protection, yet the costs were allocated 93 percent to mitigation of damages from the navigation facility and 7 percent to hurricane protection. Because the benefits from hurricane protection are several times greater than for the navigation project, the Bureau believes that a more reasonable alternative would be to allocate costs of the Seabrook feature equally between the two purposes. Subject to consideration of the comment, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army concurs in the views of the Bureau of the Budget that the costs for the Seabrook lock be allocated equally between navigation and hurricane protection which results in an additional cost of $687,000 to local interests and a corresponding reduction in the cost to the United States.

Remarks.—The committee believes that the plan of improvement is vital for preventing possible loss of life and tremendous damages to existing urban developments as well as the rapidly growing metropolitan area in the vicinity of New Orleans. The committee notes that the occurrence of a hurricane having a magnitude somewhat larger than those of recent experience would cause damages several times greater than the first cost of the recommended improvement. It is the committee's opinion that the plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers is urgently needed and should be constructed at the earliest date practicable.

OUACHITA RIVER, MONROE, LA.

(H. Doc. 328, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The city of Monroe is situated on the left bank of the Ouachita River in northeastern Louisiana, about 70 miles west of Vicksburg, Miss., and 100 miles east of Shreveport, La.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Senate and the House Committees on Public Works adopted July 24, 1958, and June 3, 1959, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for the city of Monroe provides partial protection from floods on the Ouachita River by levees and a floodwall on the left bank at Monroe and the right bank at West Monroe. The River and Harbor Act of 1950 authorized partial closure of a gap in the floodwall at Monroe which has not been constructed.

Flood problem.—During major floods local interests construct a mud-box type of emergency closure to prevent flooding through the gap. However, there is a possibility that an adequate structure could not be constructed in time or that it might fail, leaving a highly developed urban area subject to flood damages.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a concrete wall approximately 1,890 feet in length, varying in height from 5 to 7½ feet, generally landward of the top bank of the river to fill the existing gap.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1962).—

Federal	$520,000
Non-Federal	400,000
Total	920,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$15,900	$12,200	$28,100
Maintenance, operation and replacements		1,700	1,700
Total	15,900	13,900	29,800
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented			85,900
Land enhancement			10,100
Total			96,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.2.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; make relocations and alterations of streets, buildings, equipment, utilities, and other obstructions made necessary by by the construction works; hold and save the United States free from damages; and maintain and operate. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Louisiana: Favored closure of the gap but requested reconsideration of an alternative plan that would pace the wall riverward of the buildings. The Chief of Engineers advised the

State that it is the general policy of the Corps of Engineers to recommend for construction those elements or added increments where the added benefits exceed the added costs. It is the view of the Chief of Engineers that although construction of the floodwall adjacent to the river would protect an additional area not protected by the recommended plan the additional cost for this alternative plan is greater than the additional benefits that would result, and therefore should not be recommended to Congress. However, should local interests desire the alternative plan, and provided modification of the existing project is authorized by Congress, that plan could be constructed if local interests are willing to pay the difference in Federal cost between the recommended plan and the alternative plan.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee concurs that closure of the floodwall at Monroe is a logical and clearly economical undertaking. It notes that the State of Louisiana desires that further consideration be given to an alternative plan that would place the proposed floodwall riverward of existing improvements. The committee believes that in planning and designing the project, careful consideration should be given the State proposal.

BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, BAYOU BODCAU, AND RED CHUTE, LOGGY, BLACK, AND CYPRESS BAYOUS, ARK. AND LA.

(H. Doc. 203, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Bayou Bodcau drains 1,150 square miles in southwestern Arkansas and northwestern Louisiana. It rises in the vicinity of Hope, Ark., flows southerly through Bayou Bodcau Reservoir and Bodcau Lake to join Cypress Bayou and form Red Chute Bayou. The flow continues through Red Chute Bayou, Flat River, and Loggy Bayou, and enters Red River from the left bank about 40 miles below Shreveport, La.

Authority.—Two resolutions of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, adopted June 13, 1956, and May 23, 1957, concerning the advisability of improvements for flood control and related purposes.

Existing project.—Federal flood control projects in the area include: The existing project "Red River below Denison Dam, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana," which provides for construction of upstream reservoirs in combination with existing or authorized Federal and non-Federal levee improvements, channel stabilization, and incorporation of existing projects. Two of the six initially authorized reservoirs, Texarkana and Ferrells Bridge, are now in operation, and the levee and bank stabilization feature below Fulton, Ark., is 87 percent complete. The Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, which contains no permanent pool, is complete for flood control; the "Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou, La.," project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, which provides for channel improvement of Loggy Bayou, Flat River, and Red Chute Bayou, has been completed. The State of Louisiana participated in the improvement.

Flood problem.—Since 1940, five floods have caused major damages in the basin. Flooding is caused by headwater overflow from Bayou Bodcau, Cypress Bayou, Black Bayou, Flat River, Red Chute Bayou,

and their tributaries, and to a lesser extent by backwater from Red River entering the area through Loggy Bayou. The average annual flood damages are estimated at $85,000 under present conditions and $59,000 under ultimate conditions with the authorized upstream reservoirs on tributaries of Red River in operation.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Extension of the existing levee along Cypress Bayou, generally in a southerly direction to the junction of Cross Bayou and Red Chute Bayou and thence parallel to the west bank of Red Chute for a distance of 9.5 miles with channel clearing and snagging on Red Chute Bayou between miles 11 and 20.2 above the mouth; construction of the Flat River-Loggy Bayou levee which would extend about 32.1 miles from the lower end of the existing Red River levee in the vicinity of Ninock, La., along the high bank of Red River to a point on the right descending bank of Loggy Bayou, approximately 1 mile above its mouth, thence along the right banks of Loggy Bayou, Flat River, Red Chute, and Cutoff Bayous, and tie into the existing Red River levee near Taylortown, La.; and enlargement of 11.6 miles of the Flat River channel from Cutoff Bayou to Cooper Bayou. Landside drainage, sump areas, drainage structures, relocation of pipelines and utilities, and modification of bridges would be required in connection with the work.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1961).—

Federal	$1, 524, 000
Non-Federal	907, 000
Total	2, 431, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$48, 700	$55, 200	$103, 900
Maintenance and operation		24, 100	24, 100
Total	48, 700	79, 300	128, 000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			$53, 400
Increased land use			180, 600
Total			234, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, rights-of-way; relocations and alterations of utilities; hold and save; prevent encroachments on channels and ponding areas; maintain and operate; accomplish associated drainage works. Local interests have indicated their willingness to comply.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Generally favorable.

State of Arkansas: Favorable.

State of Louisiana: Generally favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the protection that will be provided by the flood control works recommended by the Chief of Engineers will provide for a general improvement of the agricultural

practices and economy in a portion of the Red River Basin in Louisiana.

CADDO DAM, LA.

(S. Doc. 39, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Caddo Dam is located in Caddo Parish about 19 miles northwest of Shreveport in northwestern Louisiana and the reservoir extends upstream on Cypress Creek into Texas.

Authority.—Resolution of Senate Committee on Public Works, adopted January 2, 1962.

Existing project.—The existing project, Cypress Bayou and waterway from Jefferson, Tex., to Shreveport, La., provides for dredging and straightening the channel, removing obstructions, and clearing the banks of Twelve Mile Bayou from the Red River at Shreveport, La., to Jefferson, Tex., a distance of about 66 miles; and the construction of a dam without lock at the foot of Caddo Lake. All work has been completed. The existing dam consists of approximately 3,485 feet of concrete wall supported on piling which has a crest elevation of 170.5 feet.

Problem.—The existing dam, now 50 years old, is in very poor condition. About 600 feet of the spillway section is moving downstream and only the resistance of the riprap is preventing complete failure. The rate of movement at the maximum point is about 1 inch per year. The dam has reached a stage of engineering distress so that it must either be removed so as not to constitute a hazard, or be rebuilt to maintain the status quo. If the dam should fail, or be removed, the degrading of the river would eventually cause the lake to drain and the resulting conditions would be worse from an economic standpoint than before the dam was built, since benefits from present uses of the lake would be lost or diminished. There is no legal obligation which would require perpetuating or replacing the existing structure by the Federal Government. However, in view of the history of the project, the present uses of the water and the investments which have been made by local interests in reliance upon the continued existence of the lake, there would appear to be a moral obligation on the part of the Federal Government to replace the dam.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Replacement of the existing dam at the earliest practicable date with a new structure located about 200 feet downstream, having the same flow characteristics as the existing dam. The improvement would consist of a concrete L-type wall 2,400 feet long, about 1,200 linear feet of earth embankment; collection ditches and a discharge pond downstream of the concrete structure with a final stilling basin and outlet channel leading to Bayou Black.

Estimated cost (price level of 1964).—

Federal	$1,934,000
Non-Federal	28,000
Total	1,962,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$79,000	$1,000	$80,000
Maintenance and operation	[1] 8,000		8,000
Total	87,000	1,000	88,000
Annual benefits:			
Navigation, maintenance, and operation, oilfield			83,000
Water supply			90,000
Recreation			375,000
Commercial fishing			6,000
Preservation of existing land values			427,000
Total			981,000

[1] Under the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army maintenance and operation would be a non Federal cost.

Benefit-cost ratio.—11.1.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction and maintenance; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction and maintenance.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Public Health Service: Favorable.

State of Louisiana: Favorable.

State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget concurs in the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army set forth below, and advises that there is no objection to submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army recommends construction of a replacement dam at Federal expense, subject to willingness of local interests promptly to accept and assume ownership thereof, and all responsibility for subsequent operation and maintenance, and to the other conditions hereafter mentioned.

Under the above provision local interests would be responsible for furnishing all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; and holding and saving the United States free from damages due to construction.

The Secretary of the Army also recommends that the authorization include a provision for adequate public access and recreation development under the provisions of the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, the exact terms to be arranged within the range of flexibility provided by that act.

Remarks.—The committee notes that failure of the existing Federal reservoir would cause large losses in the area near the lake in Texas and Louisiana.

For additional comments on this project, see, "Committee Recommendations."

BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TEX.

(H. Doc. 169, 89th Cong.)

Location.—White Oak Bayou is a tributary of Buffalo Bayou in the San Jacinto River Basin. The bayou, with a drainage area of about

113 square miles, lies within Harris County in and near the city of Houston.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 20, 1948.

Existing project.—The existing Federal flood control project for Buffalo Bayou and its tributaries above the Houston turning basin provides for the construction of Barker Dam and Reservoir and Addicks Dam and Reservoir near Houston; and for rectification of the channels of Buffalo, Brays, and White Oak Bayous in Houston. The authorized channel rectification of White Oak Bayou from its mouth to channel mile 8.5 is in the preconstruction planning stage. An existing navigation project for the Houston ship channel provides for a deep-draft channel, 300 to 400 feet wide and 36 to 40 feet deep, extending from Bolivar Roads at the lower end of Galveston Bay, via the San Jacinto River and Buffalo Bayou, to the Houston turning basin, about 55 miles inland from the Gulf of Mexico.

Flood problem.—The present channel capacity of White Oak Bayou at the Burlington-Rock Island Railroad bridge is estimated at 10,000 cubic feet per second. The largest flood of record in December 1935 produced a discharge of 14,750 cubic feet per second. The average annual damages under existing conditions are estimated at $91,000 and for conditions of full development, at $113,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement for the 2.1-mile reach of White Oak Bayou from the Burlington-Rock Island Railroad bridge to Cole Creek would provide for enlargement and partial concrete lining of the channel to contain the runoff resulting from the occurrence of a standard project flood. The proposed plan would provide the same degree of protection to this portion of the urban area of Houston as now authorized for the Federal flood control projects for Buffalo Bayou, Brays Bayou, and the lower reach of White Oak Bayou. Damages from floods larger than the design flood would be substantially reduced. The work would include alteration of 1 highway bridge and 1 footbridge; construction of 2 new highway bridges; and relocation of 6 pipelines and sewer lines, 1 telephone conduit structure, and 22 drainage structures.

Estimated cost (December 1963 prices).—

Federal	$1,800,000
Non-Federal	670,000
Total	2,470,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$57,000	$21,000	$78,000
Maintenance and operation	0	4,000	4,000
Total	57,000	25,000	82,000
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			100,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project; provide without cost to the United States,

all relocations and alterations of bridges, except railroad bridges, and of all buildings, structures, pipelines, sewers, and utilities made necessary by construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; establish and enforce building limit lines approved by the Chief of Engineers along the improved channel. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee is aware that the flood problem in the Greater Houston area is a continuing hazard as this rapidly growing metropolis expands. It recognizes the need to extend flood control measures as conditions warrant, and believes the proposed project is a needed and desirable undertaking.

HIGHALND BAYOU, TEX.

(H. Doc. 168, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Highland Bayou is a small coastal stream which flows southeasterly through Galveston County to enter Jones Bay about 5 miles northwest of Galveston, Tex.

Authority.—Section 204 of the Flood Control Act approved June 30, 1948.

Existing project.—No Federal flood control improvements on Highland Bayou.

Flood problem.—About 20,000 acres of urban and agricultural lands, including portions of the cities of La Marque and Hitchcock, are subject to overflow due to a channel that is inadequate to handle runoff from intense local thunderstorms and torrential rainfall associated with tropical storms.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Enlargement and rectification of Highland Bayou, construction of a dam about 8 miles above the mouth to divert flows from the upper watershed into the adjacent Basford Bayou, and construction of a diversion channel generally following Basford Bayou to Jones Bay.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1963).—

Federal	$3,500,000
Non-Federal	1,370,000
Total	4,870,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$114,000	$45,000	$159,000
Maintenance and operation	0	37,000	37,000
Total	114,000	82,000	196,000
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			671,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.4.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction; provide all relocations and alterations of bridges, except railroad bridges, and of all buildings, structures, pipelines, sewers, utilities, and any other alterations of existing improvements which may be required for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; provide and maintain all lateral channels and drains that may be necessary for proper functioning of the project; prevent any encroachment on the flood-carrying capacities of improved channels; and at least annually, notify all interested parties that the project will provide protection from upstream flooding up to the standard project flood but will not provide protection from hurricane or storm tide flooding. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection. The Bureau noted, however, that the recommended plan would provide a greater degree of protection than an alternative plan which on the basis of the evaluation presented would provide the largest excess of benefits over costs. The Bureau recognized, on the basis of supplemental information, that construction of the lower degree of protection could create a sense of security inconsistent with that level of protection, and probably would induce development beyond the protective capacity of such a project. On this basis the damage potential which might be expected if the lower level of protection were constructed could exceed that estimated in the report, resulting in greater residual flood damages and lower average annual benefits. The Bureau recognized, therefore, that the recommended plan which would provide the highest degree of protection should be considered the optimum protection plan, showing the greatest excess of annual benefits over annual charges. Revised average annual benefits are $696,000 and the benefit-cost ratio is 3.6 on this basis.

Remarks.—The committee believes this local protection project to be a sound and very well justified undertaking. It notes that the Bureau of the Budget considers the benefit evaluation somewhat conservative and indicates a higher benefit-cost ratio than developed by the Corps of Engineers.

TAYLORS BAYOU, TEX.

(H. Doc. 206, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Taylors Bayou is located in the southeast corner of Texas and it drains the segment of coastal plain between Port Arthur and Beaumont on the east and Galveston Bay on the west.

Authority.—Section 11 of the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project.—No Federal project for flood control or drainage in the watershed. Local interests have constructed improvements for drainage in the agricultural and urban areas in the upper basin and

improved portions of the natural channels in the basin. Also, they have constructed a salt water barrier and navigation lock near the lower end of Taylors Bayou.

Flood problems.—A total of nearly 80,000 acres is subject to flooding during periods of intense precipitation because of inadequate outlet channels for farm drainage and for floodwater from the upper reaches in Hillebrandt Bayou in the city of Beaumont.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Enlargement of more than 40 miles of natural and artificial channels in the Taylors Bayou watershed, including Hillebrandt Bayou; construction of a diversion channel via the Salt Bayou channel to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway with a salt water gate at the upper end; and construction of an adequate on-farm and group lateral drainage system.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1961).—

Federal	$6,290,000
Non-Federal	[1] 12,450,000
Total	18,740,000

[1] Includes $8,870,000 for on-farm drainage improvements above the major outlet channel.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$235,600	$513,000	$748,600
Maintenance and operation		550,200	550,200
Total	235,600	1,063,200	1,298,800
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			1,492,000
Increased land use			2,434,000
Total			3,926,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.0.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; make alterations and relocations of structures and utilities; contribute in cash 6.3 percent of the construction cost of the work to be done on the Federal project, presently estimated at $421,000, or construct such additional equivalent items of work as may be agreed upon by the Federal Government and local interests, subject to final adjustment of the amount after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; prevent encroachment in the flood-carrying capacity of the improved channels and diversion channel; and construct and maintain the local drainage works required to fully and effectively utilize the improved outlet system. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to meet these requirements.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget does not believe that sufficient reason exists for crediting local interests for work accomplished by such interests prior to project authorization;

and accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget recommends that the conditions of local cooperation be applied only to the new work recommended for construction. On that basis and on conditions and price levels prevailing in July 1961, the Bureau notes the estimated cost of the project would be $7,916,000 of which $3,008,000 would be allocated to flood control and $4,908,000 would be allocated to major drainage purposes. Given these conditions and current policies, local interests would then be expected to contribute the cost of lands and relocations ($458,000) for the flood control portion of the project and 50 percent ($2,454,000) of the total cost allocated to drainage purposes. This would result in the local interests bearing 36.8 percent or $2,912,000 of the total estimated first cost of the project. The Bureau also notes that the information on which the report is based is in large part over 10 years old and that no specific justification is presented for the substantial increase in benefits which is incorporated in the updating of the report by the Chief of Engineers. Accordingly, if the project is authorized, the Bureau would expect a reevaluation of the project prior to any request for funds to initiate the construction. The Bureau advises that subject to consideration of its views, there would be no objection to the submission of the report to Congress.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army concurs in the view of the Bureau of the Budget that a reevaluation of the project should be made prior to any request for funds to initiate construction. The Secretary recommends that local interests contribute 25.4 percent toward the cost of construction in lieu of 6.3 percent, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers. On this basis the estimated net cost to the United States would be $5,004,000 for construction and the estimated non-Federal cost would be $2,912,000 including $1,205,000 for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations, and a cash contribution of $1,707,000.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the plan of improvement would reduce flooding on nearly 80,000 acres of agricultural land near Port Arthur and Beaumont, Tex., and recommends authorization of the project in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

EL PASO, EL PASO COUNTY, TEX.

(H. Doc. 207, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The city of El Paso is in west Texas on the left bank of the Rio Grande in the reach which forms the international boundary between the United States and Mexico. The drainage area of the arroyos that flood El Paso and vicinity is 128 square miles, a large part of which is in the city limits.

Authority.—Section 206 of the Flood Control Act approved July 3, 1958.

Existing project.—There are no flood control improvements by the Corps of Engineers in the problem area under consideration.

Flood problem.—Floods from the steep arroyos reach high velocities which cause destruction of improvements and severe erosion of land in urban, suburban, and agricultural areas. Estimated value of property and improvements subject to flooding is over a quarter billion dollars. Future average annual damages are estimated at $1,090,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The recommended project is a single-purpose, local protection project for flood control at El Paso. The project would be comprised of four independent elements, one of which would be in the northwest part of El Paso, one in the central part, and two, the Copper system and Bluff Channel, in the southeast part. The plan consists generally of detention dams, diversions, interceptor and outfall channels, and appurtenant structures. The proposed improvements in the northwest area and Bluff Channel in the southeast area would change flow conditions in an international section of the Rio Grande. Therefore, it is recommended that the improvements in the central area and the Copper system in the southeast area be constructed as soon as practicable, and that construction of improvements in the northwest area and the Bluff Channel in the southeast area be deferred until such time as construction is initiated on the improvements which may be required to increase the capacity of the Rio Grande and its floodway by the International Boundary and Water Commission.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964).—

Federal	$12, 493, 000
Non-Federal	3, 131, 000
Total	15, 624, 000

Project economics.—

Area	1st costs	Annual charges	Total benefits	Benefit-cost ratio
Northwest:				
Federal	$3, 344, 000	$105, 830		
Non-Federal	729, 000	55, 170		
Total, northwest area	4, 073, 000	161, 000	$537, 200	3. 3
Central:				
Federal	7, 310, 000	231, 300		
Non-Federal	622, 000	67, 700		
Total, central area	7, 932, 000	299, 000	336, 000	1. 1
Southeast:				
Copper system:				
Federal	754, 000	23, 860		
Non-Federal	635, 700	26, 140		
Subtotal, Copper system	1, 389, 700	50, 000	(53, 500)	1. 1
Bluff Channel:				
Federal	1, 085, 000	34, 340		
Non-Federal	1, 144, 300	50, 660		
Subtotal, Bluff Channel	2, 229, 300	85, 000	(106, 200)	1. 2
Total southeast:				
Federal	1, 839, 000	58, 200		
Non-Federal	1, 780, 000	76, 800		
Total, southeast area	3, 619, 000	135, 000	159, 700	1. 2
El Paso local protection project:				
Federal	12, 493, 000	395, 330		
Non-Federal	3, 131, 000	199, 670		
Total project	15, 624, 000	595, 000	1, 032, 900	1. 7

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after com-

pletion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make any alterations to existing improvements, other than railroads or improvements constructed and maintained by the United States, which may be required because of the construction works; prevent encroachment on all of the project works which would reduce their design capacities; take steps to prevent encroachment on existing defined waterways tributary to the project by zoning or other means such as enlargement, or other modifications, of the existing waterway facilities, to prevent the minor flood problems in these tributary waterways from developing into problems of serious proportions; and inform all concerned in a manner satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers that the project is designed to control floods originating above the structures and that some residual flooding may be expected from precipitation occurring below the structures. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to cooperate.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Public Health Service: Favorable.

State of New Mexico: Favorable.

State of Texas: Favorable.

International Boundary and Water Commission: Concur, with the understanding that construction of improvements in northwest area and Bluff Channel be deferred until such time as construction is initiated on works that may be required on the Rio Grande by the Boundary and Water Commission.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—Indicated there was no assurance agreement will be reached between Mexico and the United States concerning modification of the Rio Grande project and in that event, alternative measures would be required for protecting parts of the city of El Paso. The Bureau expects that if an alternative plan is developed a showing of economic feasibility will precede any request for funds to initiate construction. Subject to consideration of this comment the Bureau has no objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the Chief of Engineers recommends deferral of construction of the improvements for the northwest area and the Bluff Channel in the southeast area until construction is started on improvements which may be required to increase the capacity of the Rio Grande floodway by the International Boundary and Water Commission. The committee concurs in this recommendation and believes that construction of the other elements in the plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers is urgently needed for flood protection at El Paso.

ARKANSAS RIVER, LAS ANIMAS, COLO.

(H. Doc. 169, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Las Animas is located on the south bank of the Arkansas River in southeastern Colorado about 75 miles upstream from the Colorado–Kansas State line.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Senate Commerce Committee adopted September 30, 1942, and the House Food Control Committee adopted July 2, 1943.

Existing project.—There is no existing flood control project at Las Animas. The Pueblo Reservoir authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation as an element of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project is located about 117 miles upstream from Las Animas and it will reduce floodflows materially.

Flood problem.—Sediment deposited in the river channel has gradually reduced the capacity so that overbank flow now occurs at about 6,500 cubic feet per second and urban flooding occurs at 10,000 cubic-feet per second. The maximum flood of record with a peak flow of 187,000 cubic feet per second would cause more than $3 million in damages which would be reduced to about $2.5 million with Pueblo Reservoir constructed.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a levee about 9.6 miles long on the right bank of the Arkansas River beginning about 5½ miles upstream from the city of Las Animas and extending downstream to the mouth of the Purgatoire River, a left bank levee extending about 1 mile upstream from the junction of Colorado State Highway 194 and U.S. Highway 50, protective measures for the levees, and interior drainage works.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963).—

Federal	$1,541,000
Non-Federal	184,000
Total	1,725,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$48,800	$5,800	$54,600
Maintenance and operation		4,400	4,400
Total	48,800	10,200	59,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			70,500
Increased land utilization			3,900
Total			74,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, including easements required for flood-zoning purposes in the ponding areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; at least annually inform individuals concerned about the residual flood problem involved owing to temporary ponding; prevent encroachment on the river channel, which would reduce the design flow capacity through the leveed section and on the ponding areas and interior drains; and, if ponding area capacity is impaired, provide substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity promptly without cost to the United States; make any alterations to existing improvements, other than railroad bridges and approaches in connection therewith; and maintain and operate the works after completion, including the overbank clearing under and between the new highway bridge and the existing railroad bridge. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Colorado: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee believes the project to be well formulated and notes that due consideration has been given the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation. The committee is convinced that the plan as proposed will greatly ameliorate an existing problem of sediment deposition in the reach of the river at Las Animas.

ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES AT GREAT BEND, KANS.

(H. Doc. 165, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Great Bend, the county seat of Barton County, is located on the left bank of the Arkansas River at river mile 873 about 228 miles downstream from the Colorado-Kansas State line. The city is bordered on the north and east by the Walnut Creek watershed and on the south by the Arkansas River.

Authority.—Resolutions of the House Flood Control Committee adopted July 2, 1943, and January 21, 1944.

Existing project.—There is no Federal flood control project at Great Bend. Local interests in cooperation with the Works Progress Administration constructed some flood protection works on the Arkansas River and Little Walnut Creek.

Flood problem.—Aggradation from sediment deposit has reduced the channel capacities to 4,000 cubic feet per second on the Arkansas River and 2,100 cubic feet per second on Walnut Creek. The maximum flood of record on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, which was partially controlled by John Martin Dam, and a peak discharge at Great Bend of 20,200 cubic feet per second. A recurrence of a discharge of this magnitude under existing conditions would cause damages estimated at $1,770,000. The maximum flood of record on Walnut Creek had a discharge of 12,700 cubic feet per second near Albert, about 14 miles northwest of the city. A recurrence of this flood would cause damages estimated at $2,345,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of 6.2 miles of leveed channel to divert Walnut Creek floodflows around Great Bend into the Arkansas River at a point southwest of and upstream from the city; a leveed channel 1.5 miles long to direct Little Walnut Creek floodflows into the Walnut diversion channel; 6 miles of improved channel with levees along the Arkansas River; and a tieback levee 4.3 miles long on the left bank of the river upstream from the entrance of the Walnut diversion channel; and appurtenant works.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1963).—

Federal	$4, 030, 000
Non-Federal	1, 810, 000
Total	5, 840, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$127,600	$57,280	$184,880
Maintenance and operation	0	29,820	29,820
Total	127,600	87,100	214,700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			826,800
Land enhancement			16,400
Total			843,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.9.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project, including easements required for flood-zoning purposes in the ponding areas; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and free from claims as a result of flooding from residual interior runoff during operation of the project; prohibit any encroachment on the design capacities of the river channel, diversion channels, interior drains, and ponding areas; and if the ponding area capacities are impaired, provide promptly, without cost to the United States, substitute storage or equivalent pumping capacity; inform periodically all concerned, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army, that some flooding will continue to occur because of temporary ponding; make any alterations to existing improvements, other than railroad bridges and approaches connected therewith; provide fences on both sides of the Walnut diversion channel for structural protection and as a safety measure during periods of high flow; and maintain and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Kansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that a serious local flood problem exists at the city of Great Bend, and will become more critical. It believes the project as proposed is highly justified and notes that local interests are willing to participate to a sizable extent toward its construction.

JOHN REDMOND RESERVOIR, GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER, KANS.

(S. Doc. 27, 89th Cong.)

Proposed project modification for acquisition of additional lands for a National Wildlife Refuge

Authority.—Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, approved August 12, 1958 (Public Law 85–624). The modification would provide for acquisition of fee title to certain lands for wildlife purposes which will require specific authorization by Congress.

Existing project.—The John Redmond Dam and Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Act of May 1950 as a unit in the general comprehensive plan for flood control, water conservation, and other beneficial water resource uses in the Grand (Neosho) River Basin. The dam will impound water forming a conservation pool of 9,400 acres. Construction of the authorized project was about 99 percent complete as of April 30, 1965.

Wildlife problem.—A study by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife indicated that the Grand (Neosho) River valley is one of the principal migration routes for certain geese and ducks. Also, the John Redmond Reservoir is strategically located and provides an excellent opportunity to develop the waterfowl potential of the area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The national wildlife refuge as proposed will use the John Redmond Reservoir upstream from the town of Ottumwa, Kans. The total acreage proposed includes 24,020 acres of land and water. In addition to lands required for other project purposes, the refuge involves converting 3,400 acres from flowage easement to fee purchase within the reservoir area, and acquisition in fee of about 320 acres adjoining the reservoir.

Estimated cost.—

	Federal
Corps of Engineers	$730,000
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	585,000
Total	1,315,000

The land will be purchased by the Corps of Engineers. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be responsible for development, operations and maintenance, including funding of these items.

Project economics.—

	Lands	Development	Total
1st cost	$730,000	$585,000	$1,315,000
Investment	730,000	585,000	1,315,000
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	19,900	16,900	35,900
Operations and maintenance		75,500	75,500
Total	19,900	91,500	111,400
Annual benefits:			
Refuge			111,400
Local hunting			30,000
General recreation			25,000
Total			166,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Kansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee has considered the recommendations of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Army Engineers, Department of Defense, for developing a national wildlife refuge in conjunction with the lands and waters of the project. The committee believes that the modification of the project is desirable and should be authorized at this time.

WALNUT RIVER, KANS.

(H. Doc. 232, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Walnut River is in southeastern Kansas; it runs generally southward and joins the Arkansas River near the Kansas-Oklahoma State line.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted October 16, 1951.

Existing project.—There are no existing or authorized Federal reservoir projects in the basin. Local flood protection projects at Augusta and Winfield were constructed in 1936–38 by the Works Progress Administration.

Flood problem.—Major flooding occurred in 1923, 1928, 1944, 1945, 1951, and 1953. An average of one flood occurs on the main stem and major tributaries each year. More than 100,000 acres are subject to flooding. Average annual flood damages are nearly $1 million. Also, there have been droughts and extended periods of low flows, resulting in shortages of water.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan consists of three multiple-purpose reservoirs for flood control, conservation, recreation, and fish and wildlife, together with local flood protection projects at El Dorado and Winfield.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963).—

Federal	[1] $66,036,000
Non-Federal	770,000
Total	66,806,000

[1] United States Non-Federal interests to reimburse the amounts currently estimated at $14,131,000 for water supply and $879,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife.

Construction costs.—

Reservoirs:	
El Dorado	$23,300,000
Towanda	23,000,000
Douglass	18,200,000
Total, reservoirs	64,500,000
Local protection works:	
El Dorado	1,795,000
Winfield	511,000
Total, local protection	2,306,000
Total project	66,806,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Reservoirs:			
Interest and amortization	$2,157,500		$2,157,500
Maintenance, operation, and replacement	164,400	$91,500	255,900
Total	2,321,900	91,500	2,413,400
Local protection works:			
Interest and amortization	50,100	24,400	74,500
Maintenance, operation, and replacement	0	9,300	9,300
Total	50,100	33,700	83,800
Annual benefits:			
Reservoirs:			
Flood control			949,900
Water supply			665,300
Water quality control			447,800
Recreation and fish and wildlife			787,000
Total			2,850,000
Local protection works: Flood control			123,000

Benefit-Cost ratios.—

Reservoirs:
- El Dorado 1.2
- Towanda 1.2
- Douglass 1.2

Local protection works.—1.5.

Local cooperation.—For the reservoirs: Reimburse the United States for all costs allocated to water supply storage, currently estimated at $14,131,000 for construction and $48,600 annually for operation, maintenance, and replacements; bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with current policy, presently estimated at $879,000 and $42,900, respectively; hold and save the United States from water rights claims; keep local people advised of project effects for flood protection. For the local protection projects: Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the projects; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make all alterations of highways, highway bridges, utilities, and related facilities occasioned by the construction works; acquire fee title to lands designated for borrow and ponding purposes and flowage easements over lands designated for ponding purposes only; prevent encroachment on the existing and improved channels.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Recommended modification of the plan of improvement by acquisition of 1,280 acres of additional land for wildlife management purposes to mitigate wildlife losses associated with El Dorado Reservoir, also fencing be provided for all lands to be used for wildlife purposes, and funds in the amount of $30,000 be furnished the Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission for initial development of wildlife habitat. The Chief of Engineers believes that reasonable effort should be

made to develop an economic analysis to provide an aid to judgment as a basis for comparison of provisions for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses with other project values and with possible alternative offsetting measures. On the basis of available information and assuming a reasonable value of man-day use it was concluded that the mitigating measures were not justified.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Kansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget noted that the State of Kansas has raised questions concerning the quality of water to be released from the proposed Towanda Reservoir. The Bureau expects that a review of these aspects would be made before funds are requested for initiation of construction of the Towanda project. The Bureau has no objection to submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended plan of improvement would have prevented most of the damages from the June 1965 flood, one of the most severe floods of record. Nearly $3.5 million in damages would have been prevented in cities like Augusta and to crops that were in advanced growth or ready for harvesting.

For additional comments on this project, see "Committee recommendations."

SHIDLER RESERVOIR, SALT CREEK, OKLA.

(H. Doc. 242, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Salt Creek is a tributary of the Arkansas River in north-central Oklahoma.

Authority.—Section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, and also a resolution of the Senate Public Works Committee adopted February 21, 1958.

Existing project.—There is no Federal flood control project on Salt Creek.

Flood problem.—Annual flood losses are estimated to average $86,600. There is a need for a dependable source of water supply for municipal and industrial purposes and for water quality control.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A multiple-purpose reservoir on Salt Creek near Shidler, to serve the purposes of flood control, water conservation, and recreation.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963).—

Federal	$6,150,000
Non-Federal	(1)
Total	6,150,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to repay an estimated $967,000 for water supply and $119,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife.

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$200,200
Maintenance and operation and recreation	57,800
Total	258,000
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	131,300
Water supply	51,500
Quality control	28,500
Recreation	92,000
Total	303,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—

Local cooperation.—Reimburse the United States for all costs allocated to water supply storage, currently estimated at $967,000 for construction and $11,000 annually for operation, maintenance, and replacements; bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with current policy, presently estimated at $119,000 and $13,600, respectively; hold and save the United States from water rights claims; keep local interests advised that the reservoir will not afford total flood protection. Local interests indicate willingness to meet all the requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: The Secretary of the Interior commented that the interests of the Osage Indians could be adversely affected by the project; and that the plan does not provide adequately for protection of fish and wildlife resources. The Chief of Engineers assured the Secretary that planning and construction activities will be coordinated with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to insure fair and equitable adjustments for damages and adverse effects attributable to the project; also, that while much study was given the recreation and fish and wildlife aspects of the proposed project, these values will be reexamined prior to construction.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Public Health Service: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

State of Oklahoma: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget pointed out that a significant portion of the benefits from the flood control, recreation, and conservation functions of the proposed reservoir would not be derived for many years, and accordingly, that the project is substantially justified on the basis of expected future requirements. Accordingly, the Budget expects that prior to construction the conservation and flood control benefits, in particular, would be critically examined.

Remarks.—The committee believes that the Shidler Reservoir is an important unit for the development of the water resources of the Arkansas River Basin and for the economic development of northern Oklahoma and further believes that it should be authorized as recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

BIG CREEK AT HAYS, KANS.

(S. Doc. 22, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Big Creek is a left-bank tributary of Smoky Hill River in west-central Kansas. Hays, county seat of Ellis County, has a population of about 12,000.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted May 29, 1951.

Existing project.—While there are no existing Federal improvements in the Big Creek Basin, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is currently preparing a feasibility report on the Ellis irrigation unit, which includes a multiple-purpose reservoir at the Round Mound site about 17 miles upstream from Hays.

Flood problem.—Flooding at Hays is caused by overflows from Big Creek, Lincoln Draw, and Chetolah Creek. Although the frequency and maximum severity of Big Creek floods at Hays would be reduced by the potential Round Mound Reservoir, a recurrence of the 1951 flood would be largely unaffected, since the storm which generated that flood was centered below the damsite. Average annual flood damages, under existing conditions, are estimated at about $265,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan consists of channel improvements and levees along Big Creek, a diversion channel and levee on Lincoln Draw, and a detention structure, channel improvements, and levees on Chetolah Creek.

Estimated cost (price level of 1963).—

Federal	$2,702,000
Non-Federal	1,009,000
Total	3,711,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$85,600	$33,200	$118,800
Maintenance and operation	0	7,900	7,900
Total	85,600	41,100	126,700
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			243,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.9.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, etc.; hold and save the United States from damages; perform necessary alterations and relocations of utilities and structures; maintain and operate the project; prevent encroachments on improved channels; keep local people informed of project effects. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Kansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The city of Hays is a well-developed community subject to relatively high annual flood damages considering its size and

population. The recommended work is considered clearly justified, and the committee urges adoption of the project.

LITTLE NEMAHA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NEBR.

(H. Doc. 160, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Little Nemaha River is a right bank tributary of the Missouri River in southeastern Nebraska. The basin has a length of about 60 miles and an area of 885 square miles.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted June 21, 1944.

Existing project.—There is no existing corps project entirely within the basin. A completed unit of the Missouri River agricultural levee project is located along the right bank of the Missouri River above and below the mouth of the Little Nemaha River, with tieback levees along both banks of that tributary.

Flood problem.—The principal flood problem is in the lower segment of the basin, where average annual flood damages exceed $100,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Levees and appurtenant improvements on Little Nemaha River downstream from the vicinity of Brock to the upstream end of existing tieback levees, a distance of about 20 miles. Tributary tieback levees would be built along numerous tributary streams.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

Federal	$1,524,000
Non-Federal	236,000
Total	1,760,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$59,200	$9,200	$68,400
Maintenance and operation		4,700	4,700
Total	59,200	13,900	73,100
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			118,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and operation of these works, including those necessary for ponding of interior drainage; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; perform without cost to the United States all necessary alterations or replacements of bridges, roads, miscellaneous utilities, and other existing improvements, except railroad bridges and approaches, required in connection with these works; prevent encroachments on the improved channels that would impair their capacity; maintain and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and at least annually inform interests affected that the levees will provide protection against floodflows only slightly greater than that experienced during the flood of July 1958 at Auburn. Local interests have indicated their willingness to comply.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Nebraska: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that careful consideration has been given to numerous alternative plans for dealing with the water problems of the area, and that the recommended plan meets with the desires of local interests, is functionally suitable, and amply justified.

BIG SIOUX RIVER, IOWA AND S. DAK.

(H. Doc. 199, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The Big Sioux River rises in northeastern South Dakota and flows generally south to join the Missouri River just above Sioux City, Iowa.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Public Works Committee adopted July 29, 1955.

Existing project.—There is a Federal flood control project in the basin providing for channel improvement, levees, and a diversion channel at the city of Sioux Falls. Also, there is an authorized but unconstructed harbor project at the mouth of the river at Sioux City, Iowa.

Flood problem.—Floods generate from snowmelt in the spring and from heavy rainfalls in early and late summer. The channel of the lower Big Sioux River is tortuous and winding and its capacity is small causing frequent flooding of agricultural lands and improvements in the area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Consists of enlargement, cleanout, and channel cutoffs on the Big Sioux River from its mouth to about 2 miles north of Akron, Iowa. Minor alterations to one highway bridge and two short sections of gravel road would be required.

Estimated cost (October 1963 prices).—

Federal	$6,400,000
Non-Federal	384,000
Total	6,784,000

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$265,500
Maintenance and operation	20,000
Total	285,500
Annual benefits: Damages prevented	324,600

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; all necessary alterations and relocations; maintain and operate the project; hold the United States free from damages; provide lands required for fish and wildlife mitigation measures; develop, manage, and maintain fish and wildlife facilities and habitat areas; keep local interests advised of flood protection effectiveness of the improvement. Local interests have indicated a willingness to comply.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of South Dakota: Favorable.
State of Iowa: Does not concur in fish and wildlife mitigation plan. Have expressed the view that the report should be delayed pending results of authorized study of upstream reservoirs. It is the view of the Chief of Engineers that the proposed project will be compatible with, and enhanced by, any future flood control plan that might be developed for the upper basin, and will not become redundant as a result of any upstream reservoirs that may later be authorized and built. It is his further view that this proposed project will not bar consideration of other projects which may be developed in the basin in the future. He therefore recommends authorization of the project without further delay. If the project is authorized, the corps will continue coordination with concerned interests during advanced planning with a view to developing a mutually agreeable fish and wildlife mitigation plan.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the State of South Dakota favors the project. Also, that a preponderance of affected local interests in the area to be protected favor the project, but the State of Iowa does not concur completely in the plan. The committee believes the project is a worthy undertaking, but that in its planning and design phases continued effort should be made to develop a project mutally agreeable, insofar as possible, to all concerned.

CHARITON AND LITTLE CHARITON RIVERS, IOWA AND MO.

(*H. Doc. 238, 89th Cong.*)

Location.—The Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers are left-bank tributaries of the Missouri River which together drain an area of 3,080 square miles in southern Iowa and north-central Missouri.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955.

Existing project.—Three sections of channel improvement along main stem of the Chariton completed in 1950 and 1952. A tieback levee at the mouth of the Chariton River is authorized by construction deferred for coordination with authorized Missouri River agricultural levee system. The authorized Rathbun Reservoir on Chariton River in southern Iowa is in the preconstruction planning stage.

Problems.—Streams of the basin are subject to both floods and droughts. There are problems of floods, pollution, and inadequate low flows. The average annual flood damages along Mussel Fork and lower Shoal Creek in the Chariton River Basin and along the Little Chariton River and its tributaries are estimated at $370,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A reservoir on the East Fork of the Little Chariton at Long Branch site; a total of about 80 miles of channel improvements, mostly in the lower portion of the basin.

Estimated cost (1962 prices).—

RESERVOIRS

	Long Branch
Federal	$5,280,000
Non-Federal	(1)
Total	5,280,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to repay an estimated $530,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife.

CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS

	Mussel Fork	Little Chariton	Shoal Creek	Total
Federal	$1,267,000	$2,581,000	$39,000	$3,887,000
Non-Federal	219,000	598,000	5,000	822,000
Total	1,486,000	3,179,000	44,000	4,709,000

TOTAL FOR PROGRAM

Federal	$9,167,000
Non-Federal	822,000
Total	9,989,000

Project economics.—

RESERVOIRS

	Long Branch
Annual charges	$203,600
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	75,200
Water supply	
Quality control	85,400
Recreation and fish and wildlife	91,800
Total	252,400
Benefit-cost ratio	1.2

CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS

	Mussel Fork	Little Chariton	Shoal Creek	Total
Annual charges	$56,600	$109,600	$1,440	$167,640
Annual flood-control benefits	83,400	167,100	3,900	254,400
Benefit-cost ratio	1.5	1.5	2.7	1.5

Local cooperation.—Bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with current policy, presently estimated at $530,000 and $3,000, respectively; provide the usual legal requirements of local cooperation in connection with the channel improvement work, including the provision to prevent encroachments on the improved channels that would impair their capacity.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Missouri: Favorable.
State of Iowa: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection. The Bureau of the Budget concurs in the action taken to delete Thomas Hill Reservoir from the recommended plan and advises that it would expect that prior to request for funds to initiate construction of Long Branch Reservoir, a reanalysis of project economics would be made and submitted to it for information.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army noted that subsequent to submission of the report by the Chief of Engineers, on March 22, 1965, a supplemental review of the Thomas Hill Reservoir that is being constructed by local interests showed the reservoir does not conform to the project plan in the corps recommendation and that its authorization would pose difficulties in regard to reimbursement and cooperative arrangements as well as administrative and technical complications. Therefore, the Chief of Engineers now recommends against authorization of the Thomas Hill Reservoir as a Federal undertaking and the Secretary of the Army concurs in this recommendation. On this basis the total Federal construction cost of the recommended plan, including Long Branch Reservoir and the channel improvements, is estimated at $9,167,000.

Remarks.—The committee concurs in the action of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army to delete the Thomas Hill Reservoir from the plan of improvement for the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers, since local interests have upon their own initiative undertaken construction of a reservoir which does not provide the optimum water resource development at the site.

GRAND RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISSOURI AND IOWA

(H. Doc. 241, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Grand River Basin comprises about 7,900 square miles in northwestern Missouri and southwestern Iowa. The river is a left bank tributary of Missouri River about 250 miles upstream from St. Louis.

Authority.—Flood Control Acts of 1936, 1938, and 1946.

Existing project.—There are no federally constructed flood control improvements in the Grand River Basin. However, the Chillicothe Dam and Reservoir, now in inactive status, was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938; and the Missouri River agricultural levee project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, includes units at the mouth of the Grand River.

Flood problem.—Both droughts and floods have harassed the basin and Grand River discharges have aggravated flooding along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Damage within the basin from the June 1947 flood was estimated in excess of $22 million. Droughts, on

the other hand, have created critical municipal water shortages in the past.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan consists of a system of multiple-purpose reservoirs and local protection works. The reservoirs, ranging in size from 183,000 to 2,720,000 acre-feet of storage capacity, would control 62 percent of the drainage area of the basin and provide a total of over 2½ million acre-feet of water conservation space. The plan includes about 100 miles of channel improvements and 210 miles of levees.

Estimated cost (price level of 1961).—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Reservoirs	$252,020,000	(1)	$252,020,000
Channel and levee works	26,615,000	$2,902,000	29,517,000
Total	278,635,000	2,902,000	281,537,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to bear construction costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife currently estimated at $19,860,000.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Reservoirs:			
Interest and amortization	$8,666,000		$8,666,000
Maintenance, operation, and replacement	529,000	$101,000	630,000
Total	9,195,000	101,000	9,296,000
Levees and channels:			
Interest and amortization	812,400	87,800	900,200
Maintenance and operation	0	125,600	125,600
Total	812,400	213,400	1,025,800
Annual benefits:			
Reservoirs:			
Flood control			6,815,000
Water quality control			137,000
Recreation and fish and wildlife			3,600,000
Power			946,000
Total			11,498,000
Channels and levees: Flood control			2,432,200

Benefit-cost ratios.—

Reservoirs:	
Pattonsburg	1.3
Trenton	1.3
Mercer	1.5
Linneus	1.0
Brookfield	1.3
St. Catherine	1.1
Braymer	1.1
Channels and levees	2.3

Local cooperation.—With respect to channel and levee works, provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction and maintenance of these works; including rights-of-way required for ponding of interior drainage; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; perform without cost to the United States all necessary alterations or replacements of bridges, roads, miscellane-

ous utilities, and other existing improvements required in connection with these works, except railroad bridges and approaches; prevent encroachment on the improved channels that would impair their capacity; operate and maintain each element of the work after its completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Chief of Engineers; with respect to the reservoirs, contribute to the control of pollution of the streams subject to low-flow augmentation by adequate treatment or other methods of controlling wastes at their source; protect channels downstream from the reservoirs from encroachments which would adversely affect operation of the system; hold and save the United States free from all water-rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the reservoirs; and exercise, to the full extent of their legal capability, control against removal of streamflow made available by reservoir storage; bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with current policy, such amounts currently estimated at $19,860,000 and $101,000, respectively.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Recommended certain measures be taken as part of the project to insure continued efficient operation of the State's Fountain Grove Wildlife Area. The Chief of Engineers replied that the suggested measures could be included in the project and that he believes the estimates of project cost are adequate to develop a satisfactory plan for uninterrupted operation of the wildlife area. Also, Interior noted that amounts to be reimbursed for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement have been combined, and indicated that the costs should be separated. The Chief of Engineers pointed out that the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act makes little distinction between recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement and that many details in the matter of cost sharing and reimbursement remain to be resolved. However, if such a separation becomes necessary he feels the matter can be worked out equitably between the corps and non-Federal interests.

Department of Agriculture: Commented that construction of the proposed reservoirs, particularly Pattonsburg and Trenton reservoirs, would appear to adversely affect some watershed protection and flood prevention projects of the Department of Agriculture, and that these effects should be considered and the improvements coordinated prior to construction. The Chief of Engineers recognizes that close coordination of the two Departments is essential and that such coordination would be continued during preconstruction planning of the projects. The Department of Agriculture indicated that more comprehensive studies should be carried out in the basin. The Chief of Engineers pointed out that the Grand River Basin has been the subject of rather extensive studies by many agencies for many years, and that throughout the years, scales of project development and alternatives considered have been modified as necessary to reflect changing needs and conditions. Also, that as the recommended plan is developed all features will be considered again in detail and adjustments made as need be to meet existing conditions.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

Public Health Service: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of Missouri: Favorable.
State of Iowa: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection. The Bureau of the Budget noted that the Department of Agriculture believes a review of possible adverse impacts associated with land acquisition for the seven reservoirs should be made and the Bureau expects such a review would be accomplished in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture prior to a request for funds for construction of the reservoirs. The Bureau also advised that it would expect a review of hydroelectric aspects of the Pattonsburg Reservoir prior to construction of that project.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended plan will protect against the frequent flooding which occurs in the agricultural areas of the lower Grand River Basin as well as making an important contribution to the reduction of flood damages along the lower Missouri River and the Mississippi River between St. Louis and the mouth of the Ohio River. Also, the committee believes that the conservation pools will provide an important outdoor recreation resource for the Metropolitan Kansas City area and northern Missouri.

CHARTIERS CREEK BASIN, PA.

(H. Doc. 302, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Wholly within Washington and Allegheny Counties in southwestern Pennsylvania.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolutions, adopted September 10, 1956, and House Public Works Committee resolution, adopted July 31, 1957.

Existing project.—A Corps of Engineers project for channel improvement was completed recently on Chartiers Creek in the vicinity of Washington and the township of Canton. An approved project for channel improvement on Robinson Run at Oakdale, under Public Law 685, is inactive owing to the failure of local interests to meet the local cooperation requirements. The Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, is studying the possibility of providing small detention structures on headwater streams above Washington and above Oakdale.

Flood problem.—Flooding occurs all along Chartiers Creek, but the most severe flood damage occurs in two reaches: The Carnegie-Bridgeville reach, where flooding occurs on the average of once a year, and in the Canonsburg-Houston reach, where flooding occurs about three times in 2 years at Canonsburg and about three times per year at Houston. These areas contain many industrial firms, commercial buildings, residential areas, railroads, highways, utilities, and bridges.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Chartiers Creek, Pa., for flood control, by channel widening, deepening, and straightening, together with necessary railroad bridge changes and appurtenant works, in the Carnegie-Bridgeville and the Canonsburg-Houston reaches.

Estimated cost (price level of April 1962).—

	Carnegie-Bridgeville reach	Canonsburg-Houston reach	Total
Federal	$9,320,000	$2,887,000	$12,207,000
Non-Federal	7,300,000	768,000	8,068,000
Total	16,620,000	3,655,000	20,275,000

Project economics.—

	Carnegie-Bridgeville reach		
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$297,000	$316,000	$613,000
Maintenance and operation		39,000	39,000
Total	297,000	355,000	652,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			1,285,000
ARA			145,000
Total			1,430,000
Benefit-cost ratio			
	Canonsburg-Houston reach		
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$90,900	$23,000	$113,900
Maintenance and operation		12,100	12,100
Total	90,900	35,100	126,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			191,100
ARA			29,000
Total			220,100
Benefit-cost ratio			1.8

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project; accomplish all relocations and alterations of sewer, water, gas, oil, electric powerlines, and other utility alterations; railroad trackshifts; highway and street modifications; and construction of new, or reconstruction of existing, highway bridges made necessary by the construction work; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; establish channel limit lines within each county along the entire waterway downstream from the existing improvements at Washington, and conforming to the improvements recommended herein, and prevent any encroachment which would reduce the flood-carrying capacity of the channel so defined; at least annually notify interests affected that the project will not provide complete protection from floods greater in magnitude than that which occurred in September 1912; provided further, that improvement of either reach may be undertaken independently of the other whenever funds for that purpose are available and the prescribed local cooperation within the

county has been provided. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Pennsylvania: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Flooding occurs frequently in the two reaches of Chartiers Creek where improvements are recommended, as often as three times per year at one location. The areas inundated contain many industrial firms, commercial buildings, railroads, highways, and other high value developments. It is logical to assume that the constant flood threat is slowing the industrial and other potential of the area. Both segments of the proposed project are separately economically justified by a good margin.

SANDY LICK CREEK AT DU BOIS, PA.

(H. Doc. 185, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Du Bois is located on both sides of Sandy Lick Creek in Clearfield County, Pa. Sandy Lick Creek rises in Clearfield County and flows into Redbank Creek, which is tributary to the Allegheny River.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 7, 1954, and House Public Works Committee resolution adopted March 30, 1955.

Existing project.—There is no existing Corps of Engineers project at Du Bois, Pa.

Flood problem.—Severe flooding along Sandy Lick Creek in the vicinity of Du Bois causes considerable damage to railroads, highways, industrial plants, churches, schools, recreation areas, and commercial development. Nine bridge crossings exist in the reach recommended for improvement. Appreciable damages have been experienced due to floods despite local protection measures.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Sandy Lick Creek for flood control by channel deepening, widening, and straightening, together with necessary railroad and highway bridge replacement. Relocations would include railroad tracks, city streets, and sewer and utility lines, beginning at a point on Sandy Lick Creek approximately 1 mile below the downstream city limits and extending almost 4 miles to the upstream city limits at Shaffer Road bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1963).—

Federal	$1, 654, 000
Non-Federal	408, 000
Total	2, 062, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$66,100	$16,300	$82,400
Maintenance and operation		7,000	7,000
Land productivity loss		900	900
Total	66,100	24,200	90,300
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			80,100
Area redevelopment			21,400
Total			101,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—With AR benefits, 1.1; without AR benefits, 0.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and borrow and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project; bear the cost of private highway bridge replacement, road relocations, railroad trackshifts, electrical, communication, sewer, water, gas, oil, and other utility alterations required for the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; establish and enforce channel limit lines to prevent encroachment on the improved channel; maintain and operate the project works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and at least annually notify interests affected that the project will not provide complete flood protection. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Pennsylvania: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Flooding along Sandy Lick Creek in the vicinity of Du Bois is severe despite measures provided by local interests to protect the area. Extensive damages have been suffered by railroads, highways, industrial plants, churches, and schools. The committee notes that the justification for the work is marginal, but recommends authorization in view of the nature of the damages sustained by the community and the fact that the area is located in the Appalachia depressed area. The committee also notes that the local cooperation requirements for the recommended work are substantial, amounting to about 20 percent of the total project cost.

WABASH RIVER BASIN, LINCOLN, CLIFTY CREEK, AND PATOKA RESERVOIRS, IND. AND ILL.

(H. Doc. 202, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Wabash River Basin contains 33,100 square miles, of which 319 are in western Ohio, 8,563 in eastern Illinois, and 24,218 in Indiana. The Wabash River rises near Celina, Ohio, flows northwesterly 67 miles to Huntington, Ind., thence generally west and southwest 312 miles to the confluence of the White River, its major tributary which drains 11,400 square miles, and then continues southwesterly

96 miles to join the Ohio River at about river mile 133. The Embarrass River Basin lies entirely within the State of Illinois. The Embarrass River rises in the central part of Champaign County, near Urbana, Ill., flows in a southerly direction through Douglas, Coles, Cumberland, Richland, Crawford, and Lawrence Counties to its junction with the Wabash River at about river mile 122. The Patoka River Basin lies in southwestern Indiana above the Patoka Dam site. The Patoka River rises in southeastern Orange County, near Valeen, Ind., flows westerly through Dubois, Pike, and Gibson Counties to the Indiana State line and its junction with the Wabash River at river mile 94.6, about 1 mile below the mouth of the White River. Clifty Creek is a tributary of the East Fork of the White River. It is formed in Decatur County and flows southwesterly across Decatur County and continues in that direction to its junction with the East Fork of the White River in the middle of Bartholomew County, about 3 miles south of Columbus.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives adopted April 20, 1948, and May 6, 1958, respectively.

Existing project.—Fifty-six Federal flood control projects in the Wabash River Basin have been specifically authorized for construction. Six of these are reservoirs and the remainder are local flood protection projects.

Flood problem.—The Wabash River is subject to frequent and destructive flooding. Major floods usually occur during the winter and early spring months. The flood of March–April 1913 is the maximum flood of record followed by those of May 1943 and January-March 1950. Damages from the 1913 flood are estimated at $25 million and from the 1943 flood are estimated at $23,017,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of the Lincoln Dam and Reservoir on Embarrass River, Ill., Clifty Creek Dam and Reservoir on Clifty Creek, Ind., and Patoka Dam and Reservoir on Patoka River, Ind., for flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, water quality control, general recreation, and fish and wildlife recreation.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1963).—

Project	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Lincoln	$33,000,000	(1)	$33,000,000
Clifty Creek	15,900,000	(1)	15,900,000
Patoka River	24,000,000	(1)	24,000,000
Total	72,900,000		[2] 72,900,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to bear ½ of the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement currently estimated at $2,632,000 for the Lincoln Reservoir, $1,812,000 for the Clifty Creek Reservoir, and $2,937,000 for the Patoka Reservoir. Also $268,000 and $4,025,000 to be reimbursed for water supply storage in the Lincoln and Patoka Reservoirs, respectively.

[2] Net cost to the United States is $61,226,000.

Project economics.—

	Lincoln reservoir		
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,037,000	$92,000	$1,129,000
Maintenance and operation	43,000	225,000	268,000
Total	1,080,000	317,000	1,397,000
	Clifty Creek Reservoir		
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	419,000	58,000	477,000
Maintenance and operation	42,000	158,000	200,000
Total	461,000	216,000	677,000
	Patoka River		
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	402,000	220,000	622,000
Maintenance and operation	38,000	263,000	301,000
Total	440,000	483,000	923,000

	Lincoln	Clifty Creek	Patoka
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented	1,890,000	550,000	520,000
General recreation	865,000	591,000	1,019,000
Fish and wildlife recreation	99,000	26,000	130,000
Water supply	11,000		344,000
Water quality control	44,000		219,000
Total annual benefits	2,909,000	1,167,000	2,232,000
Benefit-cost ratio	2.0	1.6	2.2

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction of the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dam and Reservoir projects local interests will be required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest one-half of the separable cost of the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dam and Reservoir projects allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amounts involved currently being estimated at $2,632,000, $1,812,000, and $2,937,000, respectively; bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amounts involved currently being estimated on an average annual basis at $225,000 for the Lincoln, $158,000 for the Clifty Creek, and $263,000 for the Patoka Dam and Reservoir projects; reimburse the allocated construction and annual operation and maintenance costs allocated to water supply storage at the Lincoln and Patoka River Reservoirs; prevent channel encroachments tending to reduce present channel capacities; hold and save the United States free from damages from water-rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the reservoirs; exercise, to the full extent of their legal capability, control against removal of streamflow made available by reservoir storage for water quality control purposes;

and contribute to the control of pollution of the streams subject to low-flow augmentation by adequate treatment or other methods of controlling wastes at their source.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Indiana: Favorable.
State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget advises that the last increment of flood control storage at the proposed Lincoln Reservoir is not economically justified and believes that although there may be situations which require levels of development that exceed the last economically justifiable increment, it does not feel that the last added increment has been fully justified in this case. Consequently, if the project is authorized and prior to any request for funds to initiate construction, the Bureau would expect a reevaluation of the flood control benefits at the Lincoln Reservoir with a view toward determining the optimum level of flood control benefits. The Bureau notes that the Chief of Engineers has indicated his willingness to credit toward the water supply reimbursement required of the State of Indiana the cost of work performed by the State for advance engineering and design at the Patoka Reservoir. While it is not explicitly stated in the correspondence between the Chief of Engineers and the State, the Bureau of the Budget understands that current corps and Army policy would limit such credit to the cost of work performed after authorization. The Bureau also advises that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended dam and reservoir projects are amply justified and are desirable units in the overall comprehensive development of the water and related land resources of the Wabash River Basin. The committee also notes that there are substantial local contributions required for the recreation, fish and wildlife, and water supply features of the projects.

LAFAYETTE AND BIG PINE RESERVOIRS, WABASH RIVER BASIN, IND.

(S. Doc. 29, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Wabash River drains 33,100 square miles of which 11,400 are in the White River Basin. It rises in Mercer County near Celina, Ohio, flows northwesterly 67 miles to Huntington, Ind., then southwesterly to the confluence with White River and continues southwesterly 96 miles to join the Ohio River 133 miles above its mouth. The Wildcat Creek Basin is in the upper central portion of the Wabash River Basin and lies in Tippecanoe, Carroll, Howard, Clinton, and Tipton Counties, Ind. This stream drains an area of 800 square miles and empties into the Wabash River from the left bank at mile 317, a point just upstream from Lafayette, Ind. The Big Pine Creek drains 333 square miles and joins Wabash River from the right bank, opposite Attica, Ind. This watershed is situated in the

upper central portion of the Wabash Basin and lies in Warren and White Counties, Ind.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Senate Public Works Committee adopted May 9, 1949, and May 6, 1958.

Existing project.—There are no existing Corps of Engineers improvements in the Big Pine and Wildcat Creek Basins.

Flood problem.—The Wabash Basin is subject to frequent and destructive flooding. Major floods usually occur during the winter and early spring months. The flood of March–April 1913 is the maximum of record followed by those of May 1943 and January–March 1950. A recurrence of the 1913 and 1943 floods would cause damages of $18 million and $24 million, respectively, in the flood plain areas downstream from the proposed dam and reservoir projects.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of the Lafayette Dam and Reservoir on Wildcat Creek and Big Pine Dam and Reservoir on Big Pine Creek in the interest of flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1962).—

	Lafayette	Big Pine	Total
Federal	$28,000,000	$16,800,000	[1] $44,800,000
Non-Federal	[2]	[2]	[2]
Total	28,000,000	16,800,000	44,800,000

[1] Net cost to the United States, $41,810,000.
[2] Non-Federal interests to bear ½ of the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement for the Lafayette and Big Pine Reservoirs, currently estimated at $1,410,000 and $1,580,000, respectively.

Project economics.—

	Lafayette Dam and Reservoir		
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$843,000	$43,000	$886,000
Maintenance and operation	38,000	144,000	182,000
Land productivity loss	94,000		94,000
Total	975,000	187,000	1,162,000
	Big Pine Dam and Reservoir		
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$472,000	$48,000	$520,000
Maintenance and operation	42,000	126,000	168,000
Land productivity loss	32,000		32,000
Total	546,000	174,000	720,000

	Lafayette	Big Pine
Annual benefits:		
Damages prevented	$2,042,000	$741,000
General recreation	846,000	802,000
Fish and wildlife	82,000	46,000
Total	2,970,000	1,589,000
Benefit-cost ratio	2.5	2.2

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction of the Lafayette and Big Pine Dam and Reservoir projects local interests will be required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest one-half of the separable costs of the Lafayette and Big Pine Dam and Reservoir projects allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amounts involved currently being estimated at $1,410,000 and $1,580,000, respectively; bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated on an average annual basis at $144,000 for the Lafayette and $126,000 for the Big Pine Dam and Reservoir projects. Local interests would also be required to prevent encroachment which would reduce the flow-carrying capacities of the natural channels between the dams and the mouths of the channels at the Wabash River.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Indiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget advises that the proposed "Federal Water Project Recreation Act" may significantly affect the economic justification of the proposed projects. In the event that the Lafayette and Big Pine Reservoirs are authorized by the Congress, the Bureau would expect that a reevaluation of the benefits and costs would be made before funds are requested for initiation of construction of the project. The Bureau also advises that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended projects are amply justified and are desirable units in the overall comprehensive development of the water and related land resources of the Wabash River Basin. The committee also notes that there are substantial local contributions required for the recreation and fish and wildlife features of the projects.

BIG SOUTH FORK CUMBERLAND RIVER, KY. AND TENN.

(H. Doc. 175, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Big South Fork of the Cumberland River is located in north-central Tennessee and southeastern Kentucky.

Authority.—Resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committee of the U.S. Senate on March 12, 1949, and the House of Representatives on April 18, 1951.

Existing project.—There are no Federal improvements in the Big South Fork Basin. There are six existing or authorized dam and reservoir projects in the Cumberland River Basin which would be affected by the recommended project.

Flood problem.—Local interests desire construction of reservoirs to provide power, flood control, and recreation and to improve the economic status of the area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Plan provides for a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on Big South Fork, Cumberland River Basin, Ky. and Tenn., for power, flood control, and other purposes, at Devils Jumps; additional reservoir clearing at Wolf Creek project project; and modification of Lake Cumberland operation by transferring 255,000 acre-feet of flood control storage to Devils Jumps reservoir.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1958.)—

Federal	$151, 000, 000
Non-Federal	None
Total	151, 000, 000

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$5, 802, 000
Maintenance, operational and major replacements	600, 000
Taxes foregone	3, 672, 000
Total	10, 074, 000
Annual benefits:	
Hydroelectric power	12, 079, 000
Recreation	280, 000
Total	12, 359, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—None.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: No objection.
Department of Agriculture: No objection.
Department of Commerce: No objection.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Kentucky: Favorable.
State of Tennessee: Favorable.

Tennessee Valley Authority.—Project power would not be attractive to TVA at this time.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget states that the President in his natural-resources message to the Congress instructed the Bureau to reevaluate current standards for appraising the feasibility of water resource projects. If the Devils Jumps project is authorized by the Congress, the Bureau would expect that prior to a request for funds to initiate construction of the Devils Jumps project, the Corps of Engineers would reallocate the costs of the project to the extent necessary to conform to the water resources evaluation standards adopted by the administration. The Bureau advises that there would be no objection to the submission of the report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the project is an economically feasible and desirable unit in the comprehensive plan for the development of the water resources of the Cumberland River. The Corps of Engineers has recently reviewed the economics of the project and

found that it is fully justified under current standards of evaluation. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.8 as compared to 1.2 at the time the report was prepared. The Southeastern Power Administration is convinced that the power can be marketed at rates sufficient to recover all power costs within a 50-year period.

Modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army.—Subject to the additional requirement that prior to construction of Devils Jumps Dam and Reservoir local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that, in accordance with the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, they will:

(*a*) Administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement;

(*b*) Pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable cost of the project allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amount involved currently being estimated at $407,000; and

(*c*) Bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated at $56,000 on an average annual basis.

Provided, That the sizing and responsibility for development, operation, maintenance, and replacement of the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement features of the reservoir may be modified in accordance with the alternatives provided in the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, depending upon the intentions of non-Federal interests regarding participation in the costs of these features at the time of reservoir construction and subsequent thereto, and that appropriate adjustments reflecting such modifications may be made in the allocation of costs to other project purposes.

This modification would reduce the estimated Federal cost from $151,100,000 to $150,693,000 and increase the non-Federal cost from zero to $407,000; average annual non-Federal operation, maintenance and replacement costs would be increased from zero to $56,000.

ROWLESBURG RESERVOIR, CHEAT RIVER, W. VA.

(H. Doc. 243, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Cheat River, the second largest tributary of the Monongahela River, drains 1,424 square miles in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. The basin is oblong is shape, having an average length of approximately 102 miles and an average width of about 14 miles. The topography is generally rugged and characterized by bold parallel ridges separated by deep valleys. Topographic relief varies between elevation 778 mean sea level at the mouth of Cheat River and elevation 4,842 in the southern part of the basin. Coal mining, leather processing, and textile manufacturing are the principal economic activities. A large steam-generated powerplant at Albright, W. Va., and a hydroelectric powerplant at Lake Lynn, Pa., on the Cheat River, are operated by subsidiaries of

the Allegheny Power System. Population of the basin in 1960 was estimated at 52,000.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives adopted April, 30, 1958, and June 3, 1959, respectively.

Existing project.—There are no Corps of Engineers improvements for flood control in the basin.

Flood problem.—Cheat River floods contribute to flood stages in both the Monongahela and Ohio Rivers. The towns of Rowlesburg, Manheim, and Albright, which are damaged by Cheat River floods, would be protected by the proposed reservoir. The major flood damages occur in the flood plains of the Monongahela and upper Ohio Rivers, where average annual damages are estimated at $2,404,000. Damages experienced along the entire Ohio River would be affected by a reservoir at Rowlesburg.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on the Cheat River above Rowlesburg, W. Va., for flood control, water quality control, recreation, and hydroelectric power production.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1963).—

Federal	[1] $133,548,000
Non-Federal	[2]
Total	133,548,000

[1] Includes $1,881,000 and $2,180,000 to be reimbursed by local interests for water quality control and recreation features, respectively.

[2] Non-Federal interests to bear ½ of the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement currently estimated at $2,180,000, and pay $1,881,000 for water quality control.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$4,520,000	$62,000	$4,582,000
Maintenance and operation	1,147,000	187,000	1,334,000
Total	5,667,000	249,000	5,916,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			2,094,000
Hydroelectric power			6,503,000
Water quality control			2,730,000
Recreation			958,000
Total			12,285,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1 to 1.

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction of the Rowelsburg Dam and Reservoir project, local interests will be required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest one-half of the separable costs of the Rowelsburg Dam and Reservoir project allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amount involved currently being estimated at $2,180,000; reimburse the costs allocated to water quality control, currently estimated at $1,881,000; bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated on an average annual basis at $187,000. Local interests would also be

required to furnish assurances that they will hold and save the United States free from any claims for damages from storage of water; and provide adequate waste treatment at the source within a reasonable period of time and preserve existing and augmented low flows for intended water quality purposes as contemplated under the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of West Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget recommends that the hydroelectric power features described in the project report not be authorized for Federal construction at this time. Further consideration of Federal development should be deferred pending completion of action on the application by the Federal Power Commission. Should the Commission act favorably, it would be expected that the power company would undertake the power development within a reasonable period of time. Should the Commission act unfavorably on the application or should the power company fail to undertake the power development within a reasonable period of time, consideration could then be given to whether the power features should be authorized for Federal development. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, subject to consideration of the above recommendation, there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that provision of the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir which is located in the Appalachia depressed area would significantly improve the economic condition of the region with a resulting increase in the overall well-being of the communities. The committee also notes that the recommended improvement has a very good benefit-to-cost ratio.

BIG SANDY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, KENTUCKY, WEST VIRGINIA, AND VIRGINIA

Location.—The Big Sandy River Basin is located in eastern Kentucky, western West Virginia and the northern tip of Virginia. Big Sandy River, formed by the junction of Tug and Levisa Forks at Louisa, Ky., flows northerly about 27 miles, and enters the Ohio River about 10 miles downstream from Huntington.

Authority.—Partial response to resolutions adopted April 21, 1954, and March 19, 1963, by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and adopted June 19, 1963, by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives.

Existing project.—One reservoir project (Dewey Reservoir) and two local protection projects (Prestonsburg, Ky., and Williamson, W. Va.) have been completed. The Dewey Reservoir is located on Johns Creek. The Prestonsburg, Ky., local backwater protection project was completed in 1959 at a cost of $371,000 and consists of a levee and a pumping station for protection of Prestonsburg from Levisa Fork backwater floods. The Williamson, W. Va., local protection project was completed in 1963 at a cost of about $1,060,000 and con-

sists of a floodwall with gate openings and a pump station and will provide protection for the main part of Williamson against floods equal to the major flood of record. Projects presently under construction are the Fishtrap, the John W. Flannagan, and the North Fork of Pound Reservoir projects. One reservoir (Haysi Reservoir project) is authorized by the 1938 Flood Control Act as a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control in the Ohio River Basin. Stream snagging and clearing projects to alleviate flooding at Langley and in the Wayland through Garrett area on the Right Fork of Beaver Creek in Floyd County, Ky., and at Meta on Johns Creek at Pike County, Ky., have been found to be feasible for construction under authority of section 2 of the Flood Control Act of 1937, as amended.

Flood problem.—The Big Sandy River Basin is subject to frequent and destructive flooding. Major floods usually occur during the winter and early spring months. The flood of 1957 resulted in damages amounting to $32,707,000 on Levisa Fork and $6,085,000 on Tug Fork. The damages from the March 1963 flood were estimated to be $19,951,000 in the Big Sandy River Basin, with $17,761,000 being on Levisa Fork and $2,190,000 on Tug Fork.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The recommended plan of improvement provides for construction of the Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Dam and Reservoir projects and construction of a channel improvement project on Beaver Creek for protection of Martin, Ky.

Estimated cost (price level of 1964).—

	Reservoirs			Local protection, Martin, Ky.	Total
	Yatesville	Paintsville	Panther Creek		
Federal	$20,077,000	$16,974,000	$11,094,000	$3,346,000	$51,491,000
Non-Federal	[1] (2,600,000)	[1] (965,000)	[1] (503,000)	110,000	110,000
Total	20,077,000	16,974,000	11,094,000	3,456,000	51,601,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to reimburse the United States for ½ the separable costs or recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Project economics.—

	Reservoirs			Local protection, Martin, Ky.	Total
	Yatesville	Paintsville	Panther Creek		
Annual charges:					
Federal:					
Interest and amortization	$563,000	$543,000	$360,300	$133,600	$1,599,900
Maintenance	57,500	57,200	56,900	0	171,600
Total, Federal	620,500	600,200	417,200	133,600	1,771,500
Non-Federal:					
Interest and amortization	84,300	32,900	17,100	4,500	138,800
Maintenance	262,000	107,200	55,200	20,000	444,400
Land productivity	35,700	22,000	2,300		60,000
Total, non-Federal	382,000	162,100	74,600	24,500	643,200
Total charges	1,002,500	762,300	491,800	158,100	2,414,700
Annual benefits:					
Flood control	283,500	159,800	133,200	159,400	735,900
Recreation	1,272,000	523,000	279,100		2,074,100
Water quality	210,000	357,000	105,000		672,000
Total	1,765,500	1,039,800	517,300	159,400	3,482,000
Benefit-cost ratio	1.8	1.4	1.1	1.01	1.4

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction of the Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Dam and Reservoir projects, local interests will be required to give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that for each major project they will in accordance with the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable first cost of the reservoir projects allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amounts involved being currently estimated as follows:

Reservoir	Total amount	Initial amount	Future amount
Yatesville	$2,600,000	$1,024,000	$1,576,000
Paintsville	965,000	725,000	240,000
Panther Creek	503,500	387,000	116,500
Total	4,068,500	2,136,000	1,932,500

Bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amounts involved being currently estimated as follows on an average annual basis:

Reservoir	Total amount [1]	Initial amount [1]	Future amount [2]
Yatesville	$262,000	$125,000	$212,000
Paintsville	107,000	88,000	29,000
Panther Creek	55,000	45,000	15,500
Total	424,000	258,000	256,500

[1] Values are on average annual basis distributed over the economic life of the project.
[2] Not discounted.

Provided further, that the sizing and responsibility for development, operation, maintenance, and replacement of the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement features of the reservoirs may be modified in accordance with the alternatives provided in the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, depending upon the intentions of local interests regarding participation in the costs of these features at the time of reservoir construction and subsequent thereto, and that appropriate adjustments reflecting such modifications may be made in the allocation of costs to other project purposes; and provided further that the local participation in the recreation and fish and wildlife features may be modified to conform with standards established by studies made pursuant to programs pertaining to Appalachia; hold and save the United States free from damages resulting from water rights claims due to construction and operation of the project; exercise to the full extent of their legal capability, control against removal of streamflow made available for water quality control; contribute to the control of pollution of streams subject to low-flow augmentation by adequate treatment or other methods of controlled wastes at their source; and protect channels downstream from the reservoir from encroachment which would adversely affect operation of the reservoir system; prior to construction of the channel improvement project on Beaver Creek for the protection of Martin, Ky., local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, spoil-disposal areas, and rights-of-way required for construction and operation of these works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction work; perform without cost to the United States all necessary utility relocations and alterations, highway or highway bridge construction, and other alterations required in connection with these works; prevent encroachments on the improved channel which might interfere with the proper functioning of the project; maintain the improved channel in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and at least annually inform interests affected that the channel improvement will not provide complete protection against a flood greater than that which occurred in January 1946.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Kentucky: Favorable.
State of West Virginia: Favorable.
State of Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget advises that it would expect a reanalysis of the benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. Subject to the above consideration the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the Big Sandy River Basin is located within the boundaries of the Appalachian region which is

under study by the President's Appalachian Regional Commission to determine steps to be taken in a long-range effort to stabilize and revitalize the economy of this chronically depressed area. The committee notes also that provision of the recommended improvements would significantly improve the economic conditions of the area with a resulting increase in the overall well-being of the communities.

The committee expects that prior to initiation of construction, the Chief of Engineers will prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. Appropriate language has been included in the bill on this matter.

MARTINS FORK RESERVOIR, UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, KY.

(June 2, 1965)

Location.—The Upper Cumberland River Basin, which contains 1,977 square miles, is that portion of the basin which lies above Cumberland Falls. The Cumberland River is formed by the junction of Poor and Clover Forks, 132 miles above Cumberland Falls. Martins Fork joins Clover Fork at the town of Harlan, Ky.

Authority.—Resolutions by the Public Works Committee of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives adopted March 19, 1963, and June 19, 1963, respectively.

Existing project.—There are no existing Corps of Engineers flood control projects in the Martins Fork Basin.

Flood problem.—All reaches of Martins Fork except for the extreme upper reaches have flood problems. Floods are severe in the middle portions of the stream and become disastrous in the lower reaches. Harlan is the principal damage center.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on Martins Fork located at stream mile 14.8 in the interest of flood control, water quality control, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1964).—

Federal	$4,860,000
Non-Federal	[1] (345,000)
Total	4,860,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to reimburse the United States for ½ the separable costs of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$150,800	$11,500	$162,300
Maintenance and operation	15,000	35,000	50,000
Land productivity loss		2,300	2,300
Total	165,800	48,800	214,600
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			157,800
Water quality			114,000
Recreation			83,800
Total			355,600

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.7.

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction, local interests are required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will prevent encroachment on downstream channels to the extent needed to provide for effective reservoir operation; at least annually notify interests affected that the project will not provide complete flood protection; hold and save the United States free from damages due to water rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the project; contribute to the control of pollution of the streams subject to low-flow augmentation by adequate treatment or other methods of controlling wastes at their source; and exercise, to the full extent of their legal capability, control against removal of streamflow made available by reservoir storage for water quality control. In accordance with the proposed Federal water project recreation cited above, administer project lands and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable first cost of the project allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amount involved currently being estimated at $345,000; and bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated at $35,000 annually.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Commonwealth of Kentucky: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that construction of the Martins Fork Dam and Reservoir which is located in the Appalachian depressed area would significantly improve the economic condition of the region with a resulting increase in the overall well-being of the communities. The improvement has a good benefit-to-cost ratio. The committee also notes that there is s substantial local contribution required for recreation and fish and wildlife features of the project.

EAST ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY, ILL.

(H. Doc. 329, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The East St. Louis leveed area is located on the left bank of the Mississippi River across from the city of St. Louis, Mo. It extends from Cahokia Creek diversion channel on the north to Prairie du Pont Creek on the south, a distance of about 20 miles.

Authority.—Resolutions of the House Committee on Public Works, adopted June 17, 1948, and August 20, 1957, and the Senate Committee on Public Works, adopted July 18, 1957.

Existing projects.—The existing Corps of Engineers' flood control project for East St. Louis provides for raising and enlarging the existing levee system along the Mississippi River by the construction or reconstruction of 22 miles of levee including a section of floodwall, together with necessary appurtenant works consisting of gravity drainage structures, closure structures at highway crossings, alteration and reconstruction of existing pumping plants, service roads on

levee crown, seepage correction measures, and alterations to railroad bridges and approaches at levee crossings. The project is scheduled for completion in June 1966.

Flood problems.—About 1,400 acres in the vicinity of the Blue Waters ditch are subject to overflow causing extensive damages to residential development when drainage is blocked by high stages on Prairie du Pont Creek outside the south flank levee. Also, hillside runoff overflows existing channels and floods 18,000 acres, including residential developments and agricultural lands.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of detention areas; enlargement and extension of existing channels; construction of a pumping station for the Blue Waters ditch area; a detention reservoir on Little Canteen Creek; and appurtenant facilities for protection of the Upper Cahokia Canal, Harding ditch, and Blue Waters ditch areas. It also provides for reconstruction of the low-water dam near the mouth of the Cahokia Creek diversion channel.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1962).—

Federal	$6, 180, 000
Non-Federal	3, 160, 000
Total	9, 340, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$188, 800	$96, 500	$285, 300
Maintenance and operation		80, 400	80, 400
Loss of productivity on land		29, 200	29, 200
Total	188, 800	206, 100	394, 900
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			794, 700
Increased land use			45, 500
Total			840, 200

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; hold and save the United States free from damages; make all relocations of and modifications to highway bridges, streets, roads, sewers, and utilities; maintain and operate all the works after completion, including removal of silt and debris from impoundment areas and channels in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secreatry of the Army; prevent encroachment on imporved channels, ponding areas, and detention areas including the reservoir, and if encroachment occurs or capacities are impaired, provide substitute storage or equivalent pumping capacity promptly without cost to the United States; and at least annually notify interests affected that the project provides partial protection from the larger floods. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the project would provide needed flood protection to extensive urban and rural developments and is amply justified. The desire for the project by local interests in view of the relatively high degree of non-Federal participation is another indication of the worthiness of the undertaking.

KASKASKIA RIVER LEVEES, ILLINOIS

(H. Doc. 351, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The levees are located on the left and right banks of the Kaskaskia River in central Illinois between Cowden and Vandalia about 65 miles northeast of St. Louis, Mo.

Authority.—Section 209 of the Food Control Act, approved October 23, 1962.

Existing project.—The authorized project for the Kaskaskia River provides for the construction of a dam near Carlyle, Ill., about 50 miles downstream from Vandalia and a dam near Shelbyville about 60 miles upstream from Vandalia, in addition to nine levee projects between Carlyle and New Athens, six levee projects between Cowden and Vandalia, and a local protection project at New Athens. Construction is under way on Carlyle and Shelbyville Dams and construction on the local protection project at New Athens was started in fiscal year 1965.

Problem.—Differences in policy in effect during the periods when the Cowden to Vandalia and the Carlyle to New Athens levees were under study resulted in the authorization of projects protecting predominantly agricultural areas in which the local interests of only one reach, Cowden to Vandalia, were required to make a cash contribution in recognition of land enhancement benefits that would result from construction of the levees.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Under current policy no cash contribution would be required as an item of local participation in recognition of land enhancement benefits due to the reduction in flood hazard if the levees between Cowden and Vandalia were recommended for construction at this time. Therefore, it is recommended that the cash contribution no longer be required in connection with construction of these levees.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

Cash contribution, $3,498,000.

	Levees as authorized	Proposed modification	Project cost including modification
Federal	$5,442,000	+$3,498,000	$8,940,000
Non-Federal	4,538,000	−3,498,000	1,040,000
Total	9,980,000	0	9,980,000

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Federal	$344,000
Non-Federal	87,000
Total	431,000
Annual benefits	595,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Furnish necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; make all relocations and alterations to highways, roads, bridges, and utilities; construct drainage ditches; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; and make a cash contribution equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands acquired by the United States which, upon completion of the levee in District No. 22, will not be required for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Carlyle Reservoir. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee believes that the local participation in the project costs should be adjusted to conform to current policy, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MADISON COUNTY, ILL.

(H. Doc. 150, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The Wood River Drainage and Levee District is in southwestern Illinois along the left bank of the Mississippi River, about 15 miles upstream from St. Louis, Mo.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Senate and the House Committees on Public Works, adopted July 18 and August 20, 1957, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing project provides for protection against floods on the Mississippi River and tributary streams by construction of 22 miles of levee with appurtenant works for seepage control, closure structures for transportation routes, and pumping stations to remove blocked drainage from urban and industrial areas.

Flood problem.—Flooding still occurs on low-lying segments of agricultural and undeveloped lands within the leveed area due to interior runoff from local storms. Closure of the gravity outlets through the levee during high stages on the Mississippi River causes ponding with damages to agricultural lands, including 1,300 acres in the vicinity of Grassy Lake. About 900 acres adjacent to the hills in the northeastern part of the area are subject to flooding from the hillside runoff.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a pumping plant with collector ditches to remove impounded runoff in the vicinity of Grassy Lake.

Estimated cost (price level, July 1962).—

Federal	$179,000
Non-Federal	14,000
Total	193,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$5,500	$500	$6,000
Operation, maintenance, and replacement		3,400	3,400
Loss of production		200	200
Total	5,500	4,100	9,600
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			12,200
Increased productivity			7,900
Total			20,100

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; and prevent encroachment on improved channels or ponding areas, and if ponding areas and capacities are impaired, provide substitute storage or equivalent pumping capacity promptly without cost to the United States. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee believes that the recommended work is a practical and economical undertaking, and a worthy addition to the existing project.

IOWA AND CEDAR RIVERS, IOWA AND MINN. (INTERIM)

(H. Doc. 166, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The source of the Iowa River is in Hancock County, Iowa, while the Cedar River rises in Dodge County, Minn. Both streams flow southeasterly. Cedar River empties into the Iowa River at Columbus Junction, Iowa, 29.6 miles upstream from the mouth of the Iowa River; Iowa River enters the Mississippi River at a point 433.5 miles above the mouth of the Ohio River.

Authority.—HFCC resolution adopted July 16, 1945; SCC resolution adopted August 6, 1945; HPWC resolution adopted July 29, 1955.

Existing project.—There is one existing Corps of Engineers project in the Iowa and Cedar Basins, the Coralville Dam and Reservoir on the Iowa River, about 83 miles above the mouth of that stream, placed in operation in 1958. The Rochester Dam and Reservoir, on Cedar River about 2 miles upstream from the town of Rochester in Cedar County, is authorized but construction has been deferred for restudy. The primary purpose of these projects is to provide flood protection to areas downstream from the dams. The projects would provide no flood protection to the communities under consideration in this report. Under the provisions of section 205 of the 1962 Flood Control Act for small flood-control projects, improvements on Beaver Creek at New Hartford, Iowa, have been authorized and an investigation is in progress on Iowa River and Otter Creek at Chelsea, Iowa.

Other flood-control improvements within the basin have been constructed by local interests and by the Works Projects Administration during the 1930's. These include reaches of levees and river walls at scattered locations.

Flood problem.—Flood damages have been significant in urban and rural areas in the Iowa-Cedar Basins and are expected to increase in the future. Because topography in the upper basins is not suitable for effective reservoir storage, local protection is the only physical alternative.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvements for flood control on Iowa River and Linn Creek at Marshalltown, Iowa; and on Cedar River and Blackhawk Creek at Waterloo, Iowa; to consist of levees, floodwalls, pumping plants, drainage structures, ponding areas, interceptor sewers, bridge modification and replacement, closure structures, and channel enlargement on Linn Creek; generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable.

Estimated cost (price level of April 1963).—

	Marshalltown	Waterloo
Federal	$2,670,000	$14,900,000
Non-Federal	430,000	3,750,000
Total	3,100,000	18,650,000

Project economics.—

	Marshalltown			Waterloo		
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:						
Interest and amortization	$87,000	$14,100	$101,100	$492,800	$124,100	$616,900
Maintenance and operation	----------	31,200	31,200	----------	29,400	29,400
Total	87,000	45,300	132,300	492,800	153,500	646,300
Annual benefits: Damages prevented	----------	194,500	----------	----------	799,300	----------

Benefit-cost ratio.—Marshalltown, 1.5; Waterloo, 1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, including borrow, ponding, and spoil-disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; accomplish all relocations and alterations of buildings, utilities, highway bridges, roads, and other facilities (except railroad bridges) made necessary by construction of the project; and prevent any encroachment on the flood channels and ponding areas which would decrease their effectiveness, and if ponding areas and capacities are impaired, promptly provide substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity without cost to the United States; and provided further, that either plan may be constructed independently of the other when funds are available and the prescribed local cooperation therefor has been furnished. Local in-

terests are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Minnesota: Favorable.
State of Iowa: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the proposed construction of local protection works at Marshalltown and Waterloo are amply justified by the prevention of flood damages.

ZUMBRO RIVER, MINN.

(H. Doc. 246, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Zumbro River, a west-bank tributary of the Mississippi River, drains 1,402 square miles in southeastern Minnesota and enters the Mississippi River about 70 miles southeast of St. Paul, Minn.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Public Works Committee, adopted March 5, 1952.

Existing project.—There are no existing flood-control projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Zumbro River Basin.

Flood problem.—High flows on the Zumbro River cause substantial Flood damages in the reach from Kellogg to the mouth. Floodflows destroy crops and damage farm buildings, machinery, fences, and local roads.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for improvement of Zumbro River, below Kellogg, Minn., for flood control by construction of setback levees with 11,000 feet on the north bank and 12,360 feet along the south bank, excavation of channel cutoffs, the upper cutoff 3,800 feet long and the lower 3,170 feet long, and protection of the riverbank with riprap.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1962).—

Federal	$975,000
Non-Federal	73,000
Total	1,048,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$37,100	$2,700	$39,800
Maintenance		2,500	2,500
Total	37,100	5,200	42,300
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			54,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; contribute in cash an amount equal to 1.5 percent of the actual cost of construction, presently estimated at $15,000, necessary for widening of levees to provide for roadway,

such contribution to be paid in a lump sum prior to commencement of construction, the final allocation of cost to be made after actual costs are known; maintain all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make at their own expense any necessary alterations to utilities and highways, highway bridges, and approaches; and prevent encroachments which would reduce the flood-carrying capacity of the improved Zumbro River Channel and the area between the levees. Local interests are willing to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Minnesota: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The average annual flood damages under existing conditions are estimated at $57,800. The committee considers the project well justified and the requirements of local cooperation, including a cash contribution, are equitable and in accordance with existing policy for local flood protection projects.

BIG STONE LAKE, WHETSTONE RIVER, MINN. AND S. DAK.

(H. Doc. 579, 87th Cong. and H. Doc. 193, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Big Stone Lake is located on the Minnesota-South Dakota State line at the head of the Minnesota River. Whestone River is a tributary of the Minnesota River. The confluence of Whetstone River with the Minnesota River is immediately below Big Stone Lake.

Authority.—Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936.

Existing project.—There are no existing Federal projects in the immediate project area. Non-Federal project consists of an outlet control dam at Big Stone Lake, a diversion of Whetstone River into Big Stone Lake, a silt barrier at the diversion, and channel improvement immediately below Big Stone Lake.

Flood problem.—(1) Local interests never acquired flowage rights on Big Stone Lake. As a result the project has failed to solve the flood problems; (2) diversion of Whetstone River has resulted in excessive stages on Big Stone Lake; (3) releases of floodwaters from Big Stone Lake for long periods has resulted in flood problems to downstream agricultural interests; (4) silt deposition resulting from the diversion of Whetstone River has resulted in loss of lake area; and (5) the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Fish and Wildlife Service, finds that this area would be an unparalleled strategic location for a national wildlife refuge which would be of high value for development of waterfowl resources; and that it would be of national significance in that Bureau's migratory bird management program.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a dam, reservoir, and appurtenant works on Minnesota River above U.S. Highway No. 75, including improvement of about 2.5 miles of drainage ditch and acquisition of about 1,600 acres of additional lands bordering the reservoir specifically for wildlife conservation and development; modification of the outlet control dam, Big Stone Lake, by lowering the crest 3 feet and providing 6 feet of stoplog control; modification of the silt barrier, Big Stone Lake, by raising the crest 1 foot; bank

stabilization and related work in the lower 6-mile reach of Whetstone River; and channel improvement on Minnesota River for about 3 miles below the lake outlet control dam.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1959).—

Federal	$3, 885, 000
Non-Federal	118, 000
Total	4, 003, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$141, 600	$4, 200	$145, 800
Maintenance and operation	2, 000	3, 000	5, 000
Interest on productive land	15, 900		15, 900
Total	159, 500	7, 200	166, 700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			19, 100
Recreation			32, 000
Fish and wildlife			137, 900
Total			189, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—For the project as a whole: Contribute in cash 20 percent of the cost allocated to flood control, such contribution being presently estimated at $102,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to commencement of construction, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final allocation of cost to be made after the actual costs have been determined; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works. For the project, exclusive of the the dam and reservoir: Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; maintain and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make at their own expense all necessary changes to highways, highway bridges and approaches, utilities, and miscellaneous existing improvements; and prevent encroachments which would reduce the flood-carrying capacity of the improved channel; provided further that, prior to commencement of construction of the dam and reservoir above U.S. Highway No. 75, the Chief of Engineers and the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, shall prepare a general plan, mutually acceptable to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior, for administering the use of waters, land, or interests therein for wildlife conservation and development so as to provide the best use for all project purposes; and provided further, that the upstream work not be undertaken until construction has been started on the dam and reservoir above U.S. Highway No. 75. Local interests are willing to furnish the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Minnesota: Favorable.
State of South Dakota: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget (printed in H. Doc. 193, 88th Cong., 2d sess.).—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of the report to the Congress; it states however, should the project be authorized and the lands for the project be acquired prior to enactment of H.R. 9032, it would expect that the $28 million provided for by section 1(f) of H.R. 9032 should be reduced by the amount which would have been chargeable to that amount.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army (H. Doc. 193, 88th Cong., 2d sess.).—The Secretary of the Army states that he concurs in the views and recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report published in House Document 579, 87th Congress.

Remarks.—The committee, after careful consideration of the views of all interested parties regarding authorization of this project, is of the opinion that the project is meritorious and accordingly has included language in the bill providing for its construction as recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

The committee notes that all interested Federal and State agencies have given their indorsement to this project.

MAUMEE RIVER BASIN, FINDLAY, OHIO

(H. Doc. 158, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Findlay is the county seat of Hancock and is about 40 miles south of Toledo, Ohio. It is flooded by Blanchard River a tributary of Auglaize River which in turn is a tributary of Maumee River.

Authority.—In partial response to items in the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, and the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945.

Existing project.—There are no existing Federal flood control improvements at Findlay.

Flood problems.—Floods are an annual threat at Findlay. Serious flooding, which inundates the residential and commercial streets by overland flow from the streams, occurs on the average of once every 5 years.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Levees and floodwalls extending along both banks of Blanchard River with channel improvements; a diversion channel for Eagle and Lye Creeks about 3 miles in length; six pumping stations for interior drainage; construction of four new highway bridges and one new railroad bridge over the diversion channel; and modification of four highway and two railroad bridges over Blanchard River.

Estimated cost (price level of February 1962).—

Federal	$9,317,000
Non-Federal	3,193,000
Total	12,510,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$345,006	$148,300	$493,900
Maintenance and operation		32,500	32,500
Total	345,600	180,800	526,400
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented			642,400
Land enhancement			11,000
Total			653,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; modify or relocate buildings, utilities, roads, and other facilities where necessary for the construction of the project; construct or modify highway bridges and construct the Clay Tile Co. railroad bridge over the diversion channel; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion, including all bridge operation and maintenance; prevent any encroachment on the project flood channels and ponding areas which would decrease the effectiveness of the flood control improvements or, if ponding areas and capacities are impaired, promptly provide substitute capacities to restore the effectiveness of the flood control project; provide easements or assurance of flood plain restrictions to prevent construction of works that would exclude floodwater from the designated natural storage areas on Blanchard River immediately upstream from the project, and provide assurances of flood plain restrictions in the designated flood plain on Blanchard River immediately downstream of the project and to permit such improvements downstream of the project only if the effects thereof on the Findlay flood protection project are negligible or if compensating works in the form of channel improvements are provided; and reimburse the United States a sum estimated at $75,000 for non-Federal items of local cooperation which are included in the Federal construction cost and comprise bridge abutment costs in excess of normal floodwall sections and additional fill for the East Main Cross Street embankment. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Ohio: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Serious flooding occurs on the average of once every 5 years. A recurrence of the flood of March 1913, the maximum of record, under present conditions would cause damages estimated at $10,370,000. The committee notes that the proposed improvement is economically justified and considers that authorization of the project is warranted.

CHAGRIN RIVER, OHIO

(S. Doc. 35, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Chagrin River is in northeastern Ohio and flows into Lake Erie about 15 miles east of Cleveland.

Authority.—Resolution by the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate adopted July 25, 1952.

Existing project.—There are no existing Federal flood control or navigation projects in the basin. In October 1960, residents of a flood area in the village of Willoughby Hills completed a local channel improvement consisting of straightening a short reach of existing channel and excavating a section of new channel across a meander. During the summer months, local interests have intermittently dredged a navigation channel through the sandbar at the mouth of the river. Generally, the effectiveness of the channel is lost in the next major storm.

Flood problem.—Most of the major floods in the basin have resulted from rain on snow-covered or frozen ground. In the lowermost reaches of the river, flooding is aggravated by the sandbar in Lake Erie at the mouth of the river. The restrictive sandbar causes ice jams from river ice which, combined with windrowed lake ice, results in significantly higher stages and damages than would otherwise occur considering only the discharge. The maximum discharge of record, which occurred during the March 1948 flood, was estimated at 21,400 cubic feet per second, with a recurrence interval of about 35 years. Five lives were lost during the January 1959 flood which was the most damaging of record, with total damages estimated at $384,000 on the basis of May 1960 price levels.

Navigation problem.—The uncertainty as to entrance conditions is a deterrent to navigation and prevents realization of the full potential of the river mouth as a small boat harbor.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of arrowhead breakwaters in Lake Erie at the mouth of Chagrin River, aggregating about 2,360 feet in length; realinement and enlargement of the Chagrin River Channel from deep water in Lake Erie through the city of Eastlake, a total distance of about 10,400 feet, with a depth of 10 feet from deep water in Lake Erie to a point about 1,750 feet above the river mouth; thence a depth of 7 feet to a point about 3,500 feet above the river mouth; and thence uniform bottom slopes to the upstream limit of the improvement; levees, with a total length of about 7,000 feet, where required to supplement channel enlargement; a spur channel for navigation, 100 feet wide, 6 feet deep, and about 1,500 feet long; an access channel for navigation, 50 feet wide and 4 feet deep, from deep water to the secondary river channel; and recreational facilities at the river mouth.

The improvement for navigation and flood control may be undertaken independently of providing public recreational fishing facilities whenever funds are available and the required local cooperation has been furnished. The sizing and responsibility for development, maintenance, and replacement of these recreational fishing facilities may be modified in accordance with the alternatives provided in the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act (H.R. 5269, 89th Cong.), depending on the intentions of non-Federal interests regarding

participation in the costs of these features at the time of construction and subsequent thereto.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1963).—

Federal	$2,200,000
Non-Federal	755,000
Total	2,955,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$88,500	$30,500	$119,000
Maintenance and operation	7,500	10,500	18,000
Total	96,000	41,000	137,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			76,200
Enhancement			22,800
Recreational boating			103,000
Recreational fishing			103,000
Total			305,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.2.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of that portion of the first cost of Federal construction allocated to recreational navigation, such contribution presently estimated at $498,000 to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction and maintenance of the project including initial and subsequent spoil-disposal areas and any necessary retaining dikes and bulkheads, or the cost of such retaining works, and any subsequent redistribution of spoil material required; hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages incident to construction, operation, and maintenance of the project; provide without cost to the United States all alterations and relocations to existing improvements including highways, buildings, utilities, sewers, and other facilities which may be required because of the project; maintain and operate the project after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army except for Federal maintenance of aids to navigation; breakwaters; the entrance channel from deep water in Lake Erie to the shoreline, 275 to 220 feet wide, and about 1,000 feet long, to a depth of 10 feet; a part of the navigation channel from the shoreline upriver, 100 feet wide and about 3,100 feet long, to a depth of 10 feet for about 1,750 feet, thence a depth of 7 feet for about 1,350 feet; and a stub channel about 250 feet long beginning about 1,400 feet above the shoreline, generally 100 feet wide with widened approaches, to a depth of 10 feet; prescribe and enforce regulations to prevent obstruction or encroachment on channels and rights-of-way necessary to proper functioning of the project for flood control; prescribe and enforce speed limits to prevent damage by wave wash to the banks of project channels; establish a competent and properly constituted public body empowered to provide, maintain, and operate local harbor facilities,

with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and service areas, including a public landing with suitable supply facilities, a launching ramp, parking areas, and access roads, open to all on equal terms; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable cost of the structural modifications necessary to provide for recreational fishing facilities on the breakwaters, and one-half of the cost of associated access facilities and parking areas with adequate sanitary facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated at $80,000; and bear all costs of maintenance and replacement of these modifications and associated facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated at $3,000 on an average annual basis.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Ohio: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—There are no existing Federal flood control or navigation projects in the basin. The committee believes that the annual benefits from the project will provide a very favorable economical project.

GRAND RIVER, GRANDVILLE, MICH.

(H. Doc. 157, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The city of Grandville is located on the main stem of Grand River in the southwestern portion of Kent County, Mich.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 16, 1950. (This is an interim report in response to the above authority.)

Existing project.—There are no Corps of Engineers flood control projects at Grandville.

Flood problem.—Parts of Grandville are flooded in varying degrees on the average of once a year with 10 major floods having occurred since 1900.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement consists of about 10,000 feet of levee, two closure structures, and associated interior drainage works, including a storm-drain interceptor system and a pumping plant.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1961).—

Federal	$1,373,000
Non-Federal	55,000
Total	1,428,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$49,600	$3,200	$52,800
Maintenance and operation		7,500	7,500
Total	49,600	10,700	60,300
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			75,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow areas, necessary for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; accomplish all relocations and alterations of streets, buildings, pipelines, utilities, bridges, and other structures (except railroad facilities) made necessary by the construction work; maintain and operate the project after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and prescribe and enforce regulations to prevent encroachment on rights-of-way needed for proper functioning of the project. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Parts of Grandville are flooded in varying degrees on the average of once a year. At least 10 major floods have occurred during the period 1901 to 1958. Based on the state of development and prices in 1961, recurrence of the record flood of March 1904 would cause damages estimated at $783,000. The committee considers this project economically justified and recommends its adoption.

WINSLOW, ARIZ.

(S. Doc. 63, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The area under consideration comprises a drainage area of 26 square miles tributary to the Little Colorado River in Coconino and Navajo Counties, at and in the vicinity of the city of Winslow in northeastern Arizona.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted November 6, 1957.

Existing project.—There are no Corps of Engineers' projects for flood control. The Federal Aviation Agency has constructed a diversion levee and channel above Winslow Municipal Airport, to divert small and medium flows from Ice House Wash to Ruby Wash. Local interests have constructed other minor channel improvements along Ruby and Ice House Washes. These improvements do not adequately control floodflows.

Flood problem.—The washes rising southwest of Winslow and flowing through the urban and adjacent areas into the Little Colorado River flood plain are inadequate to carry without damage the floodflows resulting from the highly intense rainfall of local thunderstorms.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A diversion levee and channel 5.5 miles long extending from the Winslow Municipal Airport to the Little Colorado River, and enlargement of the Ice House Wash Channel along a 2-mile reach.

Estimated cost (price level of September 1961).—

Federal	$2,775,000
Non-Federal	165,000
Total	2,940,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$104,000	$8,000	$112,000
Maintenance and operation	0	11,000	11,000
Total	104,000	19,000	123,000
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			175,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; accomplish all necessary modifications or relocatoins of highways, bridges, utilities, irrigation facilities, and drainage works; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate works after completion; prevent encroachment upon improved channels and restrictive areas upstream from diversion levee. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Arizona: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The washes rising southwest of Winslow and flowing through the urban and adjacent areas are inadequate to carry without damage the floodflows resulting from the highly intense rainfall of local thunderstorms. The proposed improvements would prevent 81 percent of the potential flood damages in the area. The committee notes that the local contribution is the normal one of lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and that the improvements are economically justified.

INDIAN BEND WASH, ARIZ.

(H. Doc. 303, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Indian Bend Wash, a part of the Gila River Basin, has a drainage area of about 224 square miles in Maricopa County, Ariz., and flows into the Salt River about 10 miles east of Phoenix.

Authority.—Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938.

Existing project.—There are no completed Federal projects for flood control. The Salt River channel clearing project authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers is at the lower end of Indian Bend Wash. The Arizona Canal of the Salt River project, a Bureau of Reclamation project operated by local interests, crosses Indian Bend Wash about 7 miles upstream from the mouth.

Flood problem.—Because of inadequate channel capacity, a highly developed residential area in the city of Scottsdale is subject to damages from floods. Agricultural, irrigation, public highway, and utility properties in the area are also subject to flood damage.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Seven miles of concrete lined channel extending from the Arizona Canal to Salt River.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1961).—

Federal	$7, 250, 000
Non-Federal	1, 770, 000
Total	9, 020, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$205, 700	$64, 550	$270, 250
Maintenance and operation	0	22, 000	22, 000
Total	205, 700	86, 550	292, 250
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			530, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including spoil disposal areas; accomplish all necessary modifications or relocations of highways, bridges, utilities, and irrigation facilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate the completed works; prevent encroachment on the improved channel; notify at least annually affected interests that the project will not provide complete flood protection; any increase in costs incurred solely to reduce flood easement lands required should be borne by local interests. The Board of Supervisors of Maricopa County and the Flood Control District of Maricopa County have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Arizona: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Because of inadequate channel capacity, a highly developed residential area in the city of Scottsdale, and agricultural, irrigation, public highway, and utility properties in the area are subject to flood damage. The channel improvements would prevent about 96 percent of the potential flood damages in the area. The committee notes the favorable benefit-cost ratio and considers the project meritorious for Federal undertaking to protect a rapidly growing area.

Additional comments concerning this project are set forth in "Committee Recommendations."

SANTA ROSA WASH, ARIZ.

(H. Doc. 189, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Santa Rosa Wash, a tributary of Santa Cruz River in the Gila River Basin, is south of Phoenix and northwest of Tucson, Ariz.

Authority.—Flood Control Act, approved June 28, 1938.

Existing project.—There are no Federal improvements for flood control on Santa Rosa Wash. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has

constructed a number of small check dams to pond water for cattle. Local interests have constructed some levee and channel improvements which are inadequate.

Flood problem.—The highly developed agricultural area north of the Papago Indian Reservation is subject to flood damage.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction by the Corps of Engineers of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir for flood control, irrigation, and recreation; construction by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of an irrigation project with facilities for recreation and fish and wildlife downstream from the dam. Entire project to be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Estimated cost (all Federal, September 1962 price level).—

Corps of Engineers	$5,375,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,055,000
Total	[1] 6,430,000

[1] Includes $37,500 which would be reimbursable by local interests under the provisions of H.R. 5269.

Project economics.—

Annual charges (Federal):	
Interest and amortization	$210,000
Maintenance and operation	[1] 62,000
Total	272,000
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	527,000
Irrigation	124,000
Recreation and fish and wildlife	109,000
Total	760,000

[1] Includes $18,000 which would be a non-Federal responsiblity under the provisions of H.R. 5269.

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.8

Local cooperation.—Establish and enforce floodway limits and regulations to maintain the hydraulic capacity of the existing channel, hold and save the United States free from damages, adjust all water rights claims, and make available appropriate rights to those lands required for construction of dam and reservoir.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Arizona: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to the Congress. However, the Bureau notes that minor specific costs for recreation and fishery development are proposed to be borne federally. Because the reservoir would be located on Indian tribal lands, the usual provisions for land acquisition and public access are not being proposed in connection with the project. In view of this situation, the Bureau would recommend that the specific recreation and fishery facilities should be deleted as part of the project, and left for separate development by the Papago Indian Tribal Council. Alternatively, the Bureau would recommend development of recreation and fish and wildlife in accord-

ance with the provisions of the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, introduced as H.R. 5269 and S. 1229, and would expect that, prior to such development, public access to project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife purposes would be guaranteed.

Recommendations of the Secretary of the Army.—After consideration of the report in the light of the comments of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Army recommends the improvements as proposed by the Chief of Engineers subject to the additional requirement that the recreation and fish and wildlife facilities be developed in accordance with the provisions of the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act and that prior to such development, public access to project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife purposes would be guaranteed and assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army for participation in the recreation and fish and wildlife development would be furnished by the Papago Indian Tribal Council.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the Bureau of the Budget alternatively recommends that either the recreation and fishery facilities be deleted as part of the project and left for development by the Indians, or that such facilities be developed in accordance with the provisions of the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act. The Secretary of the Army recommends that these facilities be developed in accordance with the provisions of the proposed act. The committee also notes that the project would be located entirely on Indian lands, and that the benefits other than recreation would accrue solely to the Indians. The committee believes the project is well justified.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., AND VICINITY (INCLUDING NEW RIVER)

(H. Doc. 216, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The tributary area comprises about 2,730 square miles lying north of the metropolitan area of Phoenix, Ariz. The major watersheds are those of Cave Creek, Dreamy Draw, Skunk Creek, New River, and Agua Fria River.

Authority.—Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938.

Existing project.—No Federal flood control project in the area covered in the report. Cave Creek flood control dam, completed in 1923, was financed by State, county, city, and private interests. Lake Pleasant Reservoir, located on Agua Fria River about 25 miles upstream from its confluence with New River, was constructed in 1927 by the Maricopa County Municipal Water Conservation District No. 1. It is operated for water conservation. Two irrigation canals of the Salt River project, the Arizona Canal, and the Grand Canal, are operated to provide limited flood control.

Flood problem.—Floods result primarily from local thunderstorms of high intensity and short duration. Damage results from inundation, debris deposition, and bank and surface erosion.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The recommended plan provides for four dams and detention basins on Cave Creek, Dreamy Draw, Skunk Creek, and New River; the Union Hills and Arizona Canal diversion channels; and channel improvements on Cave Creek, Dreamy Draw, Skunk Creek, New River, and Agua Fria River.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1963).—

Federal	$58,310,000
Non-Federal	[1] 12,490,000
Total	70,800,000

[1] Includes $1,370,000 cash contribution.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,885,000	$415,000	$2,300,000
Maintenance and operation	0	228,000	228,000
Loss of productivity of land	0	212,000	212,000
Total	1,885,000	855,000	2,740,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			7,750,000
Increased utilization of land			460,000
Total			8,210,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.0.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including spoil-disposal areas, necessary for construction of the project; perform all necessary construction, alteration or relocation of highways, roads, highway bridges, and street modification; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate the works after construction; contribute in cash 2.3 percent of construction cost, presently estimated at $1,370,000, for land-enhancement benefits; prevent any encroachment on the existing or improved channels or within the detention basins that would reduce their flood-conveying or storage capacities; and hold and save the United States free from water rights claims resulting from construction, maintenance, and operation of the project.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Arizona: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to the Congress. The Bureau notes, however, that if the project is authorized further studies would be made to determine the feasibility of adding facilities for fish and wildlife and recreation to certain of the proposed detention basins. The Bureau notes that it would expect any such changes to be made in accordance with the then existing policy.

Remarks.—The committee notes the serious flood hazard which exists from thunderstorm runoff in Phoenix. It believes the recommended dams and detention basins and channel improvements and diversions will protect a fast growing and populous area.

The committee feels that the project is of an urgent nature, is well justified and that the cash contribution by local interests of a portion of the actual Federal construction cost is equitable.

EEL RIVER, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 234, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Eel River has a drainage area of about 3,600 square miles and discharges into the Pacific Ocean in northern California. The delta area under consideration in this report is about 9 miles wide along the ocean and narrows to about 1 mile approximately 11 miles inland.

Authority.—Flood Control Act of 1936, resolution of the House Committee on Flood Control adopted August 5, 1939, and resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted June 13, 1956.

Existing project.—The existing Federal flood control project provides for 3 miles of levee along the north bank of Eel River and 1 mile of levee along Strongs Creek near Fortuna.

Flood problem.—Damaging floods in the delta area occur about once every 2 years and bank erosion in this area is a continuing source of loss of valuable farmland.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Levee and channel improvements extending 15 miles upstream from the mouth of Eel River and 4 miles upstream from the mouth of Salt River.

Estimated cost (price level of 1963).—

Federal	$13,732,000
Non-Federal	3,060,000
Total	16,792,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$534,000	$119,000	$653,000
Maintenance and operation	0	40,000	40,000
Total	534,000	159,000	693,000
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented			389,000
Land enhancement			342,000
Recreational boating			39,000
Total			770,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; provide access road and parking facilities adjacent to boat-launching ramp; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate project including recreation facilities; prevent encroachment on flood channels and ponding areas and prevent unsupervised use of boat-launching area that would impair effectiveness of the project; modify or relocate all utilities, roads and bridges; and adjust all claims regarding water rights.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee is fully aware of the extreme flood hazard which exists in the Eel River Basin. Preliminary estimates indicate that the December 1964 flood which reached record proportions caused direct physical flood damages in the amount of about $60 million. Twenty-six human lives were lost. Nearly every town on the Eel River suffered some damage. Some towns, such as Pepperwood, were completely destroyed. Corps of Engineers studies indicate that the proposed levees would have prevented damages from this flood of at least $7.7 million. The committee considers that the project is urgently needed to prevent further loss of life and damage to property.

YUBA RIVER BASIN (BULLARDS BAR PROJECT), CALIF.

(H. Doc. 180, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Yuba River rises in north-central California on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada and flows in a southwesterly direction to enter the Feather River at Marysville, Calif.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted July 23, 1956.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for flood control provides for levees along Yuba River and around the city of Marysville, and Englebright Dam for hydraulic debris retention.

Flood problem.—The Yuba River Basin has experienced numerous major floods. The 1955 flood resulted in the loss of 40 lives, evacuation of 30,000 people, inundation of dwellings and loss of livestock, causing in excess of $50 million in damages.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Federal participation in the construction cost of the new Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, in recognition of the flood control accomplishments thereof, by contributing to the Yuba County Water Agency an amount equivalent to 11.5 percent of the actual construction cost exclusive of the cost for power and recreation facilities and the expenditure of an additional amount by the Federal Government for engineering and administration of funds; the total Federal contribution not to exceed $17,700,000.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

Federal	[1] $8, 979, 000
Non-Federal	143, 431, 000
Total	152, 410, 000

[1] Consists of $8,679,000 cash contribution to the Yuba County Water Agency and $300,000 for Federal cost engineering, design, supervision, and administration of funds.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$276, 000	$4, 769, 000	$5, 045, 000
Maintenance and operating	20, 000	893, 000	913, 000
Total	296, 000	5, 662, 000	5, 958, 000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			630, 000
Power			8, 776, 000
Irrigation			1, 887, 000
Recreation			230, 000
Total			11, 523, 000

[1] Present worth of $632,000 to be paid in lump sum to Yuba County Water Agency.

Benefit-cost ratio.—Project, 1.9; flood control, 2.1.

Local cooperation.—Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Yuba County Water Agency enter into an agreement providing for operation of the new Bullards Bar Reservoir in a manner that will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau notes that the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers have been formulated on the basis of a 3-percent interest rate. While use of the presently prescribed interest rate of 3⅛ percent would result in no appreciable change in the benefit-cost ratio, nor in the recommended Federal share of project cost, use of this current interest rate would reduce the maximum Federal share by $1 million. Consequently, the Bureau recommends that the maximum Federal contribution be set at $17,700,000.

Recommendations of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army concurs in the views of the Bureau of the Budget and recommends Federal participation in the construction cost of the project as proposed by the Chief of Engineers with the maximum Federal contribution limited to $17,700,000.

Remarks.—The Yuba River Basin has experienced numerous major floods. The 1955 flood resulted in the loss of 40 lives and caused in excess of $50 million in damages. Local interests desire Federal participation in the construction cost of the multiple-purpose Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, to be built by the Yuba County Water Agency, in recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the project. The committee notes that the recommended Federal monetary contribution of $8,679,000 to the Yuba County Water Agency, based on the construction costs allocated to flood control, and an additional Federal expenditure of $300,000 for Federal cost of engineering, design, supervision, and administration of funds, are well justified, as indicated by a benefit-cost ratio of 2.1. The benefit-cost ratio for the total project is 1.9.

SONOMA CREEK, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 224, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Sonoma Creek rises in the Coast Range. It flows in a generally southeasterly direction and empties into San Pablo Bay about 10 miles west of Vallejo, Calif. The creek drains an area of about 160 square miles.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolutions adopted March 16, 1954, and June 13, 1956.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project for flood control. Some levees have been constructed by local interests.

Emergency channel work and levee repairs under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and Public Law 99, 84th Congress, were accomplished by the corps following the 1955 flood.

Flood problem.—Flooding in the basin is caused by intense short-period rainfall occurring within a longer duration storm. Damages are caused by inundation and bank erosion and accrue to commercial, industrial, residential, and agricultural areas.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of about 15 miles of channel, levee reconstruction and extension, provision of facilities for draining pondage, and modification of a railroad bridge and a highway bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

Federal	$9,400,000
Non-Federal	640,000
Total	10,040,000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$374,000	$25,000	$399,000
Maintenance and operation	0	35,000	35,000
Total	374,000	60,000	434,000
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented			289,000
Erosion damage prevented			35,000
Higher land utilization			167,000
Total			491,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including ponding, borrow, and spoil-disposal areas. Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works. Accomplish all modifications or relocations of existing utilities, roads and bridges, except railroad bridges. Maintain and operate all the works after completion. Prevent encroachment on the flood channels and ponding areas. Adjust all claims concerning water rights arising from construction and operation of the improvement. Strengthen and maintain those local levee sections on the tributaries which will be retained in effect as extensions of the Federal levees to such standards as may be required by the Chief of Engineers to assure the degree of protection contemplated for the Federal project. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes the flood hazard that exists on Sonoma Creek. Damages from recurrent floods and bank erosion warrant flood protection for the agricultural and urban areas of the basin. The committee notes that the December 1964 flood caused

damages of an estimated $370,000 of which $350,000 would have been prevented by the project.

NAPA RIVER BASIN, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 222, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Napa River drains an area of about 426 square miles and flows southward through Napa and Solano Counties into San Pablo Bay in the San Francisco Bay area.

Authority.—Flood Control Acts of 1938 and 1944, and resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adpoted June 13, 1956.

Existing project.—There is no existing Corps of Engineers project for flood control. The Soil Conservation Service has been authorized to construct Redwood Creek Dam on Redwood Creek with a storage capacity of about 3,000 acre-feet for flood control and 13 miles of channel improvement along Napa River from Oakville to Napa, Calif. The existing Federal navigation project provides for a channel 100 feet wide and 15 feet deep from Mare Island causeway to Asylum Slough; thence 75 feet wide and 10 feet deep to Napa; and a turning basin 300 feet wide.

Flood problem.—High intensity rainfall produced by general storms causes the river to overflow its banks at many locations causing much damage. Floods were responsible for four deaths between 1913 and 1940.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Channel enlargement and clearing, and construction of levees and floodwalls for a 10.7 mile reach from Trancas Road in Napa to the mouth at San Pablo Bay and boat launching ramps.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963).—

Federal	$14, 950, 000
Non-Federal	3, 100, 000
Total	18, 050, 000

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$473, 500	$98, 500	$572, 000
Maintenance and operation	0	114, 000	114, 000
Total	473, 500	212, 500	686, 000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			515, 000
Land enhancement			388, 000
Recreational boating			106, 000
Total			1, 009, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; operate and maintain the works; make all necessary modifications or relocations of utilities, highway bridges and approaches, and highways and roads, exclusive of the railroad bridge and approaches; prevent encroachment on the channel works and ponding areas and if ponding areas

and capacities are impaired, provide substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity; adjust all claims regarding water rights; provide lands, or rights in lands necessary to insure public control of the recreational development; where the appraised value of such land amounts to less than 50 percent of the total first cost of the recreational development, make additional contributions sufficient to bring the non-Federal share to at least that level; operate and maintain the boat-launching ramps, access roads, parking areas, and necessary adjacent facilities for the boat-launching ramps, and assure access to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee considers the proposed project desirable and warranted for alleviation of extensive damages in the city of Napa. It is also noted that a major flood under existing conditions would endanger human life.

TAHQUITZ CREEK, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 223, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Tahquitz Creek drains a mountainous area adjacent to Palm Springs. The creek flows through developed and undeveloped land in the southern part of the city.

Authority.—Section 5, Public Law 406, 75th Congress, approved August 28, 1937.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project on Tahquitz Creek. Local interests have constructed improvements consisting of a training dike and channel upstream from the developed area and a channel with paved side slopes through the developed area.

Flood problem.—Flash floods cause inundation and debris damage to residential and business properties and restriction of future development in Palm Springs.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a debris basin just below the mouth of Tahquitz Canyon and a concrete-lined channel along Tahquitz Creek for about 3.5 miles from the debris basin to the confluence with Palm Canyon Wash.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1962).—

Federal	$3,030,000
Non-Federal	[1] 1,350,000
Total	4,380,000

[1] Includes $920,000 cash contributions.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$96,000	$44,000	$140,000
Maintenance and operations	0	25,000	25,000
Total	96.000	69,000	165,000
Anuual benefits:			
Damages prevented			100,000
Increased utilization of land			110,000
Total			210,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; perform all necessary construction or relocation of highways, roads, bridges, and utilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; construct the necessary closures to integrate the proposed improvement with existing levees on Palm Canyon Wash. maintain and operate the works after completion; prevent encroachment upon the improved channel and the debris basin that would reduce their carrying capacity; contribute in cash 23.3 percent of construction cost, presently estimated at $920,000, for land enhancement benefits.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee is aware that a serious flood hazard exists along Tahquitz Creek and that in addition to potential damage to developed properties, without flood protection, undeveloped lands in the overflow area will not be able to develop to the high level of use possible if the area is protected.

The committee feels that the Tahquitz Creek project is economically feasible, and that flood protection that would be provided for the Palm Springs area is essential for proper planning of its continued growth and development. It believes that the cash contribution by local interests of a portion of the actual Federal construction cost is equitable.

SAN DIEGO RIVER (MISSION VALLEY), CALIF.

(H. Doc. 212, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The San Diego River Basin is 435 square miles in area. It flows into the Pacific Ocean about 20 miles north of the international boundary between the United States and Mexico. Mission Valley is in the lower portion of the basin, extending from river mile 3 to 13.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution, June 3 1959.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project on the San Diego River consists of rock-revetted levees extending from the mouth to river mile 3.3.

Flood problem.—Floods in Mission Valley cause damage to transportation facilities, agricultural land and improvements, business and industrial property, utilities, and residential and public property.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a rectangular concrete channel on San Diego River with rectangular concrete sections on the downstream reaches of the tributary streams.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1943).—

Federal	$14,600,000
Non-Federal	[1] 7,700,000
Total	22,300,000

[1] Includes $1,900,000 cash contribution.

Project economics.—

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$462,000	$244,000	$706,000
Maintenance and operation	0	45,000	45,000
Loss of land productivity	0	98,000	98,000
Total	462,000	387,000	849,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			685,000
Increased land utilization			377,000
Total			1,062,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; hold and save; maintain and operate; accomplish all necessary construction or relocation of highways, roads, bridges, utilities and storm drains; contribute in cash 11.5 percent of construction cost, presently estimated at $1,900,000, for land enhancement benefits; prevent encroachment on the improved channels.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee is aware that a serious flood hazard exists along San Diego River in Mission Valley. In addition to potential damage to developed properties, without flood protection, undeveloped lands in the overflow area will not be able to develop to the high level of use possible if the area is protected.

The committee is of the opinion that the San Diego (Mission Valley) project is economically feasible, and that the flood protection that would be provided is essential for its continued growth and development. It believes that the cash contribution by local interests of a portion of the actual Federal construction cost is equitable.

For additional comments on this project see, "Committee recommendations."

WILLOW CREEK, OREG.

(H. Doc. 233, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Willow Creek and its tributaries drain an area of about 890 square miles within Morrow and Gilliam Counties in north-central Oregon.

Authority.—Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project on Willow Creek. The cities of Heppner, Lexington, and Ione have made channel improvements on Willow Creek. There are numerous small private irrigation diversions in the area.

Flood problem.—The city of Heppner is in a location of high potential damage from cloudburst-type flood. The flood of 1903 destroyed about one-third of the city and drowned 247 people out of a population of approximately 1,200. In addition to the flood potential, the adverse seasonal distribution of rainfall causes water resource problems relating to water quality, irrigation, and municipal and industrial water.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement provides for a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on Willow Creek below Balm Fork and immediately upstream of Heppner, accompanied by an improved channel through the city of Heppner, for flood control, irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, water quality control, and facilities for sports fishing, wildlife, and recreation. The reservoir would have a total capacity of 11,500 acre-feet.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963).—

Federal	[1] $6,680,000
Non-Federal	10,000
Total	6,690,000

[1] Net cost to the United States is $4,345,000 after reimbursement by local interests of costs apportioned to them for irrigation ($2,206,000), water supply storage ($72,000), and recreation ($57,000).

Project economics.—

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$222,100
Maintenance, operation, and replacement (Federal)	4,900
Maintenance, operation, and replacement (non-Federal)	6,100
Total	233,100
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	130,800
Water supply	2,400
Irrigation	85,900
Recreation	53,400
Water quality control	7,300
Total	279,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way and relocations for the channel through Heppner; hold and save the United States free from damages for construction, maintenance, and operation of the channel through Heppner; hold and save the United States free from water right claims; prevent encroachment on the channel downstream of the dam; repay the construction costs and operation, maintenance, and replacement costs allocated to irrigation

presently estimated at $2,206,000 and $1,090, respectively; repay the costs allocated to water supply presently estimated at $72,000 for construction and a nominal amount for operation, maintenance, and replacement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay one-half the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement presently estimated at $57,000; administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; and bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities presently estimated at $5,000 annually.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Oregon: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget questions certain of the economic data presented by the report but states that there would be no objection to authorization based upon the intangible benefits related to the unique and grave flood hazard present in this situation. The Bureau notes that in evaluating water supply and water quality benefits, water values were established on the basis of the cost of water stored in the proposed multipurpose reservoir and states that such evaluation deviates from the principle, established in the administration's standards for formulation of water resource projects, that all project purposes share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction. The Bureau further notes that the separable cost of conservation storage provided for the purpose of recreation including recreational fishing has not been considered in the allocation of costs. If the project should be authorized by the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget would expect that prior to any request for funds to initiate construction the project would be reevaluated and cost allocations adjusted to reflect these considerations. Subject to consideration of these comments, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee is aware of the grave flood hazard at Heppner, Oreg., and is of the opinion that this project is urgently needed for the protection of life and property.

Section 204

This section authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, in cases where responsible local interests are unable to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects, to make loans for a period of not to exceed 50 years. Projects must be located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or a subsequent similar act requiring the designation of an area by the Secretary of Commerce as a condition of such assistance.

section 205

This section modifies the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act approved October 23, 1962, so as to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on

Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. This section also provides that if the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by non-Federal interests, they shall be required to furnish the same flood control storage as proposed for the Federal projects in House Document 587, 87th Congress. This section also provides that the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SECTION 206

This section provides authorization for a comprehensive survey of water and related land resources of the southeastern Michigan area. The study area embraces the region drained by streams which discharge within the State of Michigan into the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, the Detroit River, and Lake Erie. Such a comprehensive study is designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of the flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a veiw to encouraging and supporting the optimum economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

In view of the importance of this study to the economic development of the State of Michigan and to the Nation, the Corps of Engineers is urged to prosecute the investigation with dispatch and vigor and to report back to the Congress with recommendations at the earliest practicable date.

SECTION 207

This is the customary section providing for authorization for flood control surveys and investigations at various localities. It is similar to section 105 of title I, and covers surveys at the following locations:

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the St. Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Ariz., with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Ariz., with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drains directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coastlines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

SECTION 208

This section identifies title II as the Flood Control Act of 1965.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1958 (72 STAT. 297, 300)

SEC. 104. [That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive project to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water hyacinth, alligatorweed, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, at an estimated additional cost for the expanded program over that now underway of $1,350,000 annually for five years, of which 70 per centum, presently estimated at $945,000, shall be borne by the United States and 30 per centum, presently estimated at $405,000, by local interests, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, published as House Document Numbered 37, Eighty-fifth Congress: *Provided*, That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from such operations and participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of the additional program: *Provided further*, That Federal funds appropriated for this project shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.] *(a) That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian water milfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable*

waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies: Provided, That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations: Provided further, That costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section may be borne fully by the Federal Government.

(*b*) *There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: Provided, That any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.*

APPENDIX

Corps of Engineers, Civil Works Program Statistics, June 30, 1964

NAVIGATION

General:	
Improved inland and intracoastal waterways in commercial use, miles	19,100
Improved commercial harbors	500
Navigation locks in operation	211
Navigation dams in operation (excluding multiple purpose)	154
Commerce (calendar year 1963), billion tons	1.2
Number of active navigation projects:	
Completed	2,331
Under construction	102
Balance	95
Estimated cost of active navigation projects:	
Completed, millions	$2,144
Under construction, millions	$2,755
Balance, millions	$1,441
Construction during fiscal year 1964:	
Number of projects on which construction work was performed	100
Number of projects placed in operation	25
Number of projects initiated	19
Cost of maintenance and rehabilitation during fiscal year 1964:	
Maintenance and operation, millions	$109.0
Rehabilitation, millions	15.1

FLOOD CONTROL

General:	
Reservoirs providing flood control in operation	222
Maximum flood control storage, millions of acre-feet	75.3
Local protection projects in operation	603
Flood damages prevented during fiscal year 1964, millions	$649
Flood damages prevented through fiscal year 1964, millions	$12,503
Number of active flood control projects:	
Completed	528
Under construction	154
Balance	230
Estimated cost of active flood control projects:	
Completed, millions	$1,909
Under construction, millions	$4,776
Balance, millions	$2,317
Construction during fiscal year 1964:	
Number of projects on which construction work was performed	141
Number of projects placed in operation	27
Number of projects initiated	25
Maintenance and operation during fiscal year 1964:	
Number of projects involved	153
Cost, millions	$10.9

MULTIPLE-PURPOSE PROJECTS PRODUCING HYDROELECTRIC POWER

General:	
Reservoirs in operation for hydroelectric power	39
Installed capacity of projects in operation, thousands of kilowatts	8, 514
Generating capacity installed during fiscal year 1964, thousands of kilowatts	276
Generating capacity under construction, thousands of kilowatts	4, 356
Ultimate capacity of projects completed and under cnstruction, thousands of kilowatts	17, 683
Construction during fiscal year 1964:	
Number of projects on which construction work was performed	29
Number of projects completed for full beneficial use	5
Number of projects completed for initial power operation	2
Number of projects initiated	1
Estimated cost of active multiple-purpose projects:	
Completed, millions	$2, 176
Under construction, millions	$3, 393
Balance, millions	$1, 397
Maintenance and operation during fiscal year 1964:	
Number of projects involved	43
Cost, millions	$25. 3

WATER SUPPLY

About 2.3 million acre-feet of storage space is provided in 27 reservoirs for municipal and industrial water supply to 72 localities. A dependable supply in excess of 1,300 million gallons per day is available from this water supply storage space now in operation.

RECREATION

Included in the total navigation, flood control, and multiple-purpose projects are over 300 water bodies providing opportunities for outdoor recreation. During calendar year 1963 use of these facilities totaled 147 million visitor-days, and this attendance increased during calendar year 1964 to 156 million visitor-days.

BEACH EROSION CONTROL

Under the beach erosion control program, 90 projects have been authorized by Congress, of which 54 were completed or underway through June 30, 1964. The total estimated Federal cost of the authorized projects is about $64.3 million, of which about $11 million had been appropriated through fiscal year 1964.

○

Calendar No. 448

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2300

[Report No. 464]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 19, 1965

Mr. MCNAMARA introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

JULY 19, 1965

Reported by Mr. MCNAMARA, without amendment

A BILL

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports

hereinafter designated: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

NAVIGATION

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts; House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered 226, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,112,000;

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000: *Provided*, That in order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $563,000;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Num-

bered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000: *Provided,* That any funds appropriated for the construction of this project shall not be utilized until such time as the Indiana dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by Act of Congress.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington: Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $676,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbred 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

BEACH EROSION

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,400;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

SEC. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by

them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, or in other sections of this Act, subsequent to the initiation of the studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of October 23, 1962 (Public Law 874, Eighty-seventh Congress), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act: *Provided further,* That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects herein adopted: *And provided further,* That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other projects of higher priority for improvements.

SEC. 103. That section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. (a) That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian water milfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agri-

culture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies: *Provided,* That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations: *Provided further,* That costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section may be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: *Provided,* That any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

SEC. 104. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation sea-

son on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

SEC. 106. Title I of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided,* That the authorization for any flood control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish

assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive flood-waters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided,* That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further,* That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided fur-*

ther, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

SAINT JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Still River at Danbury, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,300,000.

The project for flood protection on the Housatonic and Naugatuck Rivers at Derby, Connecticut, is hereby author-

ized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,800,000.

NEW ENGLAND-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

LONG ISLAND SOUND AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

NEW YORK-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accord-

ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

NEUSE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-

tions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

FLINT RIVER BASIN

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items: *Provided,* That said projects shall be prosecuted within the monetary authorization made available for the comprehensive plan.

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House

Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

SOUTH ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized subtantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

PHILLIPPI CREEK BASIN, FLORIDA

The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby

further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at a cost not to exceed $181,109,100, and the authorization for the lower Mississippi River project is hereby increased accordingly: *Provided,* That this authorization shall not be made available for the prosecution of any projects except those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress: *Provided further,* That any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928: *And provided further,* That the pumping plant in the Red River Backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of

Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $56,922,000.

OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

RED RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and Tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

GULF OF MEXICO

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,290,000.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of

Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha

River and Tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $278,635,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers

in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Devils Jumps Reservoir, Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $151,000,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir,

Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000: *Provided*, That prior to initiation of construction the Department of the Army will prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district),

is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000: *Provided*, That local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for flood protection on the Iowa River at Marshalltown, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

neers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,670,000.

The project for flood protection on the Cedar River at Waterloo, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,900,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Maumee River at and in the vicinity of Findlay, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 158, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,317,000.

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in

accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers

in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

EEL RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,030,000.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

SEC. 204. (a) In the prosecution of improvements of rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of

navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such improvements are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or any subsequent similar Act requiring the designation of an area by the Secretary of Commerce as a condition of such assistance, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects within such areas.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and

Deer Creeks are under construction: *Provided*, That in the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and: *Provided further*, That the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie: *Provided*, That such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal

purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided,* That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further,* That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region

draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande River and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry,

Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drains directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coast lines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

SEC. 208. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

Calendar No. 448

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2300

[Report No. 464]

A BILL

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

By Mr. McNAMARA

JULY 19, 1965
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

JULY 19, 1965
Reported without amendment

July 22, 1965

SENATE

7. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed with amendments S. 2300, to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. pp. 17684, 17687-709

8. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report to the full committee this bill, H. R. 7765. p. D704

9. HEALTH. Received and began consideration of the conference report on H.R. 6675, to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, etc. pp. 17711-22

10. FARM LABOR. Sen. Williams, N. J., reviewed housing conditions for domestic farm workers and commended a provision in H. R. 7984, the housing and urban development bill, to increase the appropriation authorization from $10 to $50 million for Federal grants for farm labor housing. pp. 17661-2

Sen. Williams, N. J., disputed "the false impression that the ending of the importation of foreign farmworkers has caused crops to rot in the fields and the prices of fruits and vegetables to increase," and inserted an editorial proposing minimum wages and collective bargaining rights for migratory farm laborers. p. 17657

11. SALINE WATER. Sen. Smathers reviewed the growing water shortage in many areas and urged acceleration of the saline water research program as a partial solution to the problem. pp. 17680-2

12. NOMINATION. Received the nomination of John W. Gardner to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. p. 17728

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. POULTRY; EGGS. Extension of remarks of Rep. St. Onge in support of legislation to establish a nationwide marketing order for table eggs and inserting several supporting statements. pp. A4077-8

14. WHEAT. Extension of remarks of Sen. Metcalf commending and inserting an editorial on the first-year results of the voluntary wheat certificate plan which states that the plan "is bringing stability to an inherently erratic situation." PP. A4078-9

Extension of remarks of Rep. Albert inserting a newspaper article, "Farmers End Up With Goat Horns--Millers, Bakers Cover Up Real Reason for Higher Bread Costs." pp. A4120-1

15. CONSERVATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Saylor commending the National Wildlife Federation and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation for planning a program of National and State awards to recognize and encourage outstanding contributions in conservation and the preservation of natural beauty. p. A4079

16. RESEARCH. Extension of remarks of Rep. St. Onge inserting an address discussing the course of technology and its effects on industry and our Nation's economic development pp. A4089-90

17. BEANS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cederberg commenting on the popularity of Michigan bean soup in the House restaurant and inserting recipes for Michigan bean sandwiches. p. A4099

18. RIVERS AND HARBORS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Secrest commending and inserting the "Report of the Projects Committee to the 52 National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress." pp. A4107-10

19. SMALL BUSINESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Evins, Tenn., inserting a report on the progress of Small Business Administration assistance programs. pp. A4113-4

20. VOTING RECORD. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cameron discussing his voting record on legislative matters including some of interest to this Department. pp. A4125-7

21. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Greigg inserted a resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa favoring the farm bill. p. A4130

22. FOOD. Extension of remarks of Rep. Evins, Colo., commending the food assistanc programs of this Department. p. A4130

23. ELECTRIFICATION; FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cameron inserting an article which "tells the dramatic story of how AID support in the form of a loan agreement for the establishment of a rural electric cooperative won a victory against political extremism in Sevilla, Columbia." pp. A4132-3

24. FARM LABOR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Talcott stating that "Of paramount concern to tomato growers is the availability of competent supplemental farmworkers" and inserting an article on this subject. pp. A4134-5

25. ECONOMICS. Rep. Multer inserted an article discussing the differences between the current economic situation and that of 1929. pp. A4137-8

BILLS INTRODUCED

26. LOANS. H. R. 10118 by Rep. Whalley, and H. R. 10123 by Rep. Hansen, Iowa, to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder; to Agriculture Committee.

27. PERSONNEL; LAW. H. R. 10104 by Rep. Celler, to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Employees", codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and to its civilian officers and employees; to Judiciary Committee.

28. WEATHER. H. R. 10106 by Rep. Hathaway, to coordinate and consolidate the major civilian marine and atmospheric functions of the Federal Government through the establishment of a Department of Marine and Atmospheric interests

Mr. CRONKITE. How, as a practical matter do you do that? I mean, what—what is your program?

Premier KY. Clean out administration, armed forces, rank, and everything. In other words, banish corruptions, injustice.

Mr. CRONKITE. Well, General, how do you expect to accomplish this when the revolutionary governments of the past couple of years haven't been able to?

Premier KY. I think I mentioned to you, I said the so-called revolutionary governments. That's a big difference because I am not politicians, but I am patriot and revolutionary man.

Mr. CRONKITE. You're going to need some politicians to do that job. Are they going to remain loyal to you while the job gets done? Do they have the same devotion you have?

Premier KY. Well, sir, I don't need people loyal to me, but I want the people loyal to the country, to my policy, which is very simple. First to give justice and freedom to the people, and then fight the Communists. So, regardless his groups, religions, if they agree with me about this policy, if they are loyal to Vietnam, I always happy to have them helping me. I don't need people loyal to me.

Mr. CRONKITE. General, when do you feel that your program will have been advanced far enough that you can return the country to a constitutional government?

Premier KY. Well, it depends on the situation military and politics, but with what I can see after 3 weeks now as Premier, I hope that we need 2 or 3 more months to see clearly and then we will decide.

Mr. CRONKITE. Should the American people be concerned about the frequent changes of government in Vietnam?

Premier KY. Not only the American, but even the Vietnamese people. We are worried, and I can say we are tired of the, you know, so often changes. This fact explains also why at the present time most, or many Vietnamese people, are so indifferent, and I think this fact is very also important and dangerous for us, because when they are indifferent people, it means they will not participate to the war effort. And as I mentioned before, they are indifferent because they are tired of so often changes of government. They cannot believe as, you know, I am sure that you heard about rumors that this Government cannot stay longer than 15 days, and now this deadline is, you know, over 15 days. Now, they said, well, no, no good in 2 months.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you feel pretty confident now that you are going to be able to hold on?

Premier Ky. Personally, yes; why not?

Mr. CRONKITE. General, is there any possibility of negotiation with the Vietcong?

Premier KY. Well, at the present time I don't see any.

Mr. CRONKITE. Could you—is there any possibility of this policy of yours creating an atmosphere in which you could invite the Vietcong to join you in this effort in your country?

Premier KY. Yes, I think, yes, because according to the information or intelligence, I think the morale of people, North Vietnam, is affected very much by these air attacks, air raids over North Vietnam. And in some areas, people of North Vietnam are taught that each time we launch an air raid, North Vietnam because somewhere in the South the Vietcong you know, make sabotage, or something like that. So, the people in North Vietnam, in some areas, ask the Communist authorities to stop all this sabotage, South Vietnam, yes. But we know we are quite sure that these air raids and bombs affect very, very much morale of the people, even the morale of the Communist troops. So if we continue or increase these air raids, and if at the same time we can drop or deliver some of our volunteer or some of the members of the friendly liberation of the North, I am quite sure they will do a good job in enrolling and getting people with them.

Mr. CRONKITE. Was it possible that the Vietcong might just quit and go underground?

Premier KY. I always said that if Ho Chi-Minh and Communist leaders are smart enough, they will accept this solution, stop fighting and continue in an underground fight. More, more dangerous because at this moment they will give to the free world, to other allied countries the impression that now they are no more aggressors and now South Vietnam is living, you know, in peace and free. This whole impression is more dangerous. That's why we never accept a cease-fire, a so-called, you know, a peace or this temporary peace. We, as General Taylor many times mentioned that we always accept a stop-fight the day that all the Communist soldiers and Asians are out of South Vietnam.

Mr. CRONKITE. Are you concerned that America might negotiate a separate agreement with North Vietnam?

Premier KY. Never do it.

Mr. CRONKITE. You don't worry about that as a possibility.

Premier KY. No. There is—no, the ally must not take this decision without the approvement of the Government of Vietnam. Because you know, why we fight Communists for 20 years now, why myself and 3 millions of North Vietnam refugees just left all our land, our houses, North Vietnam to come down here? Because we don't want Red China coming here. Why we in the past, we fought against French? Because we don't want domination, because we want independence.

ANNOUNCER. This special edition of "Face the Nation" will continue in a moment.

General Ky, though Premier of South Vietnam, is a native of Hanoi, capital of North Vietnam, and he recently proposed a new plan to hasten the defeat of the Communists there by organizing resistance, a free Vietnamese underground in North Vietnam.

He discussed this plan with Walter Cronkite.

Mr. CRONKITE. I'm very interested in this plan of yours to infiltrate North Vietnam the same way that the Communists have infiltrated South Vietnam. Why hasn't this been done before?

Premier KY. As I told you, I am not a politician. That's why sometimes my reasoning is very logical. When once you are a politician, you think as politicians—international politics, domestic—sometimes it's very difficult to be logical.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you expect this plan of yours to be put into effect soon?

Premier KY. I hope so. I hope so. I hope so.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do your American counterparts think this is a good idea?

Premier KY. Well, before I had many occasions to discuss this problem with many of my American friends, military Americans. So as you know, as they are military they all agree, even some think that it is necessary to win this war.

Mr. CRONKITE. Going into North Vietnam with a——

Premier KY. Yes.

Mr. CRONKITE. Democratic liberation front of our own. But do American politicians take a dimmer view of that?

Premier KY. Well, until now I never had the chance to speak with American politicians, as I hope that in a few days, in the very near future, I will have the chance to discuss this problem.

Mr. CRONKITE. Because you are a military man, because General Taylor, of course, is a military man, you've had an easy dialog with him?

Premier KY. Yes.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you expect it to be as easy with a political man, Ambassador Lodge?

Premier KY. Yes, why not?

Mr. CRONKITE. General Ky, thank you very much, sir. I appreciate your taking the time to meet with us today and to explain your policy.

Premier KY. Gentlemen, if my voice some day heard by American people, I would like to say something, let them know, I mean the average American, not the Government, not politicians, that we are not a puppet government, that if we fight today not because we just want to fight; not because I am military so my job is fight, fight, no. If someone in this country is tired, tired of war; if the people who really suffer in this country about war, it's military, military, not Saigonese, not the rich man, not the politicians here. We fought for 10 years. We die every day. We suffer from the war. So I can say that more than other people we like—we love peace, but peace in free—freedom—and liberty, not peace under the Communists. So, we are going to fight the Communists until the day we become a freeman or a dead man. So please understand this and help us. If the so-called free people of free countries don't understand or help us, how we can defeat the Communists? That the only thing I want the people to know, and personally, if I accept this job, it is not for, you know, having the title as a Prime Minister or just with the intention to stay here 2, 3 months getting millions of dollars and then some day fly overseas somewhere and living in peace in Washington or Los Angeles or Paris. No, I was born in this country. I'm going to die here for this country, and I'm sure that millions of other Vietnamese are ready to stay and die here for this country. So help us. That's all what I say.

Mr. CRONKITE. Well, let's all hope, General, that the dying will stop very shortly, and so will the Communist aggression. Thank you, sir.

Premier KY. OK.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am interested that the majority leader, for whose views I have the highest respect, should undertake to insert in the RECORD an interview and to comment generally favorably about the new Chief of State in South Vietnam, General Ky.

I wonder if the Senator has given any consideration to the attitude that General Ky appears to have taken with respect to two subjects which give me grave concern about the validity of his leadership.

The first is his position on civil liberties. I understand that he has set up sandbag barriers in the center of Saigon and that he has had one criminal executed—and no doubt the man deserved to die—and has indicated that in order to bring the price of rice down, he intends to execute speculators without further trial until the price of rice is brought down.

The newspapers this morning carried a gruesome picture of the torturing of Vietcong prisoners by representatives of the South Vietnamese Army. I am as aware as anyone else, of the horrible cruelties which are perpetrated on the South Vietnamese and, whenever they can, on Americans, by the Vietcong. From what I know of General Ky, he is not much better than Ho Chi-Minh with respect to his attitude toward freedom and decency of treatment. Does the Senator care to comment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall comment, but not in answer to the specific question of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The purpose of putting the interview in the RECORD was to bring home to the Senate the policies which General Ky is advocating, namely, that American troops should be on the perimeter and that the Vietnamese troops should be in the rear pacifying the villagers.

As much as we can find out about the head of a government, with which we are in a certain sense allied, ought to be put in the RECORD for the edification and education of all Americans.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 448, Senate bill 2300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, statements on Tuesday by President Johnson in his news conference show that the United States and the world are sliding further into the morass of war.

It is interesting to note that our new escalation is being fortified on the basis of alleged increases in participation in the war by North Vietnam; yet the reaction of much of our own Government suggests infiltration from the North was stepped up in 1964 after American raids on North Vietnam naval bases subsequent to the Tonkin Bay incident.

The latest off of the wire came in just a few moments ago. It reads as follows:

Three F–105 fighter bombers were shot down, the Pentagon reported, by what was described as "intense conventional ground fire" during the low-level attack on two previously undiscovered surface-to-air missile sites about 40 miles northwest of Hanoi.

The two sites, using semimobile equipment which could be put in place in as little as 24 hours, are in addition to five sites previously identified as under construction around Hanoi, the North Vietnamese capital.

The U.S. attack was launched 3 days after a U.S. plane was shot down by fire from one of the missile sites.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester told a news conference that U.S. pilots reported destruction of one of the new sites and damage to the other.

I think there is no doubt that we are galloping toward a major, massive war in Asia. Every action we have taken, we have called retaliation. Every action the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have taken, they have called retaliation. Today's raid on the missile sites is but another step in the process by which all wars begin.

In today's Washington Post, Walter Lippmann once again sets forth the unhappy, unpromising, and potentially disastrous position of the United States in Vietnam. As I have pointed out ever since our military involvement in Vietnam began, the United States is there alone. This stark fact is not covered up by the recital of token forces, largely noncombatant, that have been contributed by such dependencies of the United States as Taiwan and South Korea.

As Mr. Lippmann once again points out, the real powers of Asia—the large, rich, and populous nations upon whom the long-range stability of Asia depends—are at best unhappy bystanders. Some of them, including Indonesia, Pakistan, and India, are in varying degrees of opposition to our war policy and the most we have obtained from Japan is a lipservice which may not be forthcoming much longer.

It is this failure of the large nations of Asia to support or join our war activity in Vietnam that totally destroys the argument quoted by Mr. Lippmann from the New York Herald Tribune, which depicts the United States as saving the masses of Asia from communism. So far the only "masses" to urge us on have been the ruling factions in Thailand, Malaysia, Taiwan, the Philippines, and the white nations of Australia and New Zealand. Even these have offered little or nothing in tangible support.

What is worse, the more this becomes an American war, the less tangible support we are going to have from them. We have already seen this happen in South Vietnam itself. The efforts of the Secretary of Defense and Ambassador Taylor to increase the ratio of government troops to guerrillas have totally failed. Time after time they announced a stepping up of American military and financial aid to increase the size of the South Vietnam Army. And today, most of the same people who have persistently recommended year after year that with a little more U.S. help, South Vietnam could do the job, are now gathered in Washington to plan the replacement of the South Vietnamese war effort with a total American war effort.

It is clear that the more the South Vietnamese Army is supplied, the larger the number of desertions and the more equipment gets into the hands of the Vietcong. The briefings we receive make it impossible for one to escape the conclusion that the South Vietnamese Army is collapsing at a rapid pace. The war will be increasingly fought with American boys. That is what has been discussed at Camp David and in the precincts of the White House in recent days. That is obvious. It has not been a discussion of the political implications of war in southeast Asia, or of how to gather international support for our policy, or how to make it legal under the United Nations Charter or the U.S. Constitution. The Government continues to stand in defiance of the Constitution, article I, section 8, which places in Congress the responsibility to declare war. Not a word of the Constitution gives the President the power to make war in the absence of a declaration of war, save and except for the short period of time necessary to meet an immediate emergency that threatens the defense of this country and justifies a temporary action by way of self-defense.

The discussions taking place involve the number of American troops that must be landed, where and how, and who shall be called to the colors to prosecute the war that South Vietnam can no longer prosecute.

When the President takes to the air to tell the decisions to the American people, he will not be able to set forth the role of the United States as leader of an allied effort; he will not be able to call upon the American people to join in an allied effort in Vietnam; he will not be able to say that American boys are about to be asked to participate in an operation that the great nations of Asia or the world regard as vital to their security.

All he is going to be able to do is announce the calling up of American military forces to fight for American face and prestige in Asia. He will not even be able to say that they are going there with the blessing of people of Pakistan, India, Japan, or Indonesia, and if he is completely honest with the American people, he will tell them that three of these countries believe we should be waging a political war, not a military war, in Vietnam, and the fourth is going along with the war effort only on the surface of official policy but not at the deep grassroots of its people.

If he is completely honest, he will tell the American people that there is no major support in Asia for what we are about to do, and he will also explain that the more the war becomes an American war, the less popular and effective the United States will be everywhere in Asia. Should the war prove long drawn out, or should North Vietnam or China enter it directly, he should make it perfectly clear that the United States can expect no help whatever from any quarter in Asia, and we will be lucky if many of these countries do not actually turn on us.

We are drawing heavily upon our political capital built up in Asia over a 20-year period and the Americanization of the war will step up the process. Those are the realities of the further American takeover of the war. I hope the President will bring them out. I hope he will offer the people some explanation of why everything we have financed in South Vietnam in the last 3 years has dissolved, why the South Vietnam Army is less interested and less capable now than it was 3 years ago of resisting the Vietcong, and the extent to which we must expect the same process to take place among the other nations of the area.

Let the President also make it clear that no Asians are going to die in Asia for the face, prestige, or security of the United States. If anything, they will more likely die just to get us out, just as they died to get the Dutch, the British and the French out.

the risk of an atomic war throughout the world?

The people of America are entitled to complete information, expressed not in clever phrases or the outright lies, justified by the Defense Department, but in simple straightforward language we all can understand.

It is time our Senators and Congressmen moved to protect their constituents rather than blindly following White House policy. It is time all of us let our views be known through letters and telegrams to our representatives and our President. It very well may be that the future of the world depends upon us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this constitutes a very interesting shift in editorial policy. We are seeing increasing evidence of this. At long last, American editors are beginning to do their book work. At long last there is increasing evidence that American editors are reading something besides their own newspapers. At long last, there is increasing evidence that American editors are beginning to recognize the increasing danger that the McNamara-Rusk-Johnson war is creating in Asia to the security of our country and the peace of the world.

Oh, there have been some editors, from the very beginning, who had the courage to warn the American people of the danger. I refer again to the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. These editors have been the most farsighted and courageous of any, with regard to American foreign policy, but they have had some good colleagues for a long time. The editors of the New York Times warned us of the danger of massive war in Asia. There seems to have been at least some silence on their part in the most recent past, but I am satisfied that we cannot escape the conclusions they were setting forth in their editorials for months in regard to the danger of war in southeast Asia.

Special tribute should be paid to Mr. Higgins, the editor of that little fighting newspaper in York, Pa., called the York Gazette. Obviously a keen student, this editor, and a very courageous writer who has been, in editorial after editorial, warning the American people for months of what is going to happen. His predictions have always happened. We cannot start the type of escalation that has been going on in Asia and not escape the fact that we are going to find ourselves in a massive conflict.

I also pay my high respect to the chain of Knight papers, which for many months have been trying to warn the American people that this executive war will threaten and endanger the peace of the world, as well as the ultimate security of the United States.

It is interesting to read what the editor of the Wheeling News-Register said in the editorial which I previously asked to have printed in the RECORD. He said:

Up to now this newspaper has supported the policy of President Johnson as expressed last August in New York as follows:

"Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover, such action would offer no solution at all to the real problems of Vietnam."

The senior Senator from Oregon has quoted that statement by the President of the United States, plus the statement he made in Texas, plus the statement he made in New Hampshire during the campaign, all to the effect that he was against sending American boys to do what Asians should do. He has changed his mind. He has a right to change his mind, but the President has never advanced a sound argument in support of changing his mind.

The editorial continues:

We cannot go further. We cannot support war or the risk of atomic war without more information than the Government so far has seen fit to disclose. Why has Presidential policy completely changed? What developments have there been since last August which justify the commitment of thousands of American boys to fight and die in the swamps and rice paddies of this remote corner of southeast Asia? What changes in the world situation now justify the risk of an atomic war throughout the world?

The people of America are entitled to complete information, expressed not in clever phrases or the outright lies, justified by the Defense Department, but in simple straightforward lanuage we all can understand.

It is time our Senators and Congressmen moved to protect their constituents rather than blindly following White House policy. It is time all of us let our views be known through letters and telegrams to our representatives and our President. It very well may be that the future of the world depends upon us.

It is my belief that editorials of that type are going to increase in number in newspaper after newspaper in this country as the American people really come to grips with the awful and ugly reality that is ahead of us unless the war-making policy of the United States in Asia is changed, unless the United States starts living up to its treaty commitments, unless the United States calls for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and announces to the world that we are laying the whole threat of peace to the world before the United Nations for its jurisdiction, and that we will support the United Nations in the course of action that is taken in trying to reach a honorable, negotiated, peace settlement of this threat to the future of all mankind.

I close by saying that yesterday at the Governors' conference in Minneapolis, the Governor of Oregon, Mark O. Hatfield, made a statement which, in my opinion, is deserving of high commendation on the part of the senior Senator from Oregon. I commended the Governor once before for the efficient and effective work he did many months ago in connection with the flood disaster that struck my State of Oregon, back in January and December. Under his responsibility, it was his duty to report immediately to the Federal Government and to the President with regard to what the facts showed. He did. He worked closely with the office of the senior Senator from Oregon. He is worthy of the commendation I gave him. But we have in both parties some very blind partisans who seem to think one commits a great offense in partisan politics if he recognizes a commendable piece of work that is done by a member of the other party. I have never held to that principle.

Last night, sitting in my living room, watching television, I listened to the statement made over television by Governor Hatfield. I read an account of his statement in the press today. I sent the following telegram to Governor Hatfield:

I listened to you last night on television and also read the newspaper accounts this morning of your statement on American foreign policy in Asia. Congratulations.

You must expect to be criticized for advocating the negotiation of an honorable peace through existing procedures of international law, but the American people should face up to the fact that not even the powerful use of American military might in Asia makes right.

For a long time I have pointed out in the Senate that our Government cannot justify the killing of American soldiers in southeast Asia in an undeclared war. I am proud to stand on that record.

Although some will criticize you for it, I am proud of the statement you made yesterday at the Governors' conference. Regards.

I repeat that, in my opinion, there is a shifting in America, so far as American public opinion is concerned, in attitude in respect to the McNamara-Rusk-Johnson war in Asia. It is my opinion that the time has come—it is long overdue—for a reappraisal by the Congress of the war in Asia. I hope the Congress will stay on the job as long as American boys die in southeast Asia in this undeclared war, and that Congress will proceed to exercise its constitutional responsibility of checking the President in regard to the execution of that war.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, S. 2300, now before the Senate, is the first general river and harbor and flood control bill to come before Congress since 1962.

The Public Works Committee has devoted much time to this proposed legislation. Public hearings covered a period of 4 months, extending from March through June.

Details concerning the recommended improvements have been furnished by the Corps of Engineers.

The committee believes that each project is economically justified, having passed the formula for authorization imposed by the corps.

We believe that the projects are well conceived. Their inception stems from the knowledge possessed by one of the greatest engineering organizations in the country.

Other Federal agencies, equally well qualified, and including the Bureau of the Budget, have reviewed these projects and concurred in their construction.

The inclusion of these projects in the construction program of the Corps of Engineers will be a valuable addition to the works that are now under construction, or are on the drawing boards, for protection from floods and the betterment of navigation.

The projects to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers as a result of this authorization would consist of single- and multiple-purpose dams and reservoirs—levees, flood walls, breakwaters, and channel improvements.

All are in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, beach erosion control, and other multiple-purpose water uses.

They will provide needed flood protection to our cities and towns, as well as agricultural areas of the country.

They will enhance the use of the navigable waterways of our Nation which, as we all know, has one of the best harbor and inland waterway systems in the world.

They will provide additional water for domestic as well as industrial uses, augmenting the supply which in many sections of the country is becoming critical.

Hydroelectric power will also be generated at some of the projects recommended in the proposed legislation.

Recreational activities will be enhanced by the adoption of these projects.

All in all, the projects contained in this bill will go far in promoting and developing the Nation's water and land resources.

The projects recommended are the result, in many instances, of requests made by the Members of this body for studies of water resource problems in their States.

The committee asked the Corps of Engineers to look into these problems, and to advise the committee on the best course of action for remedying the situation.

The projects contained in this bill are the answers to these problems.

Highlights of the bill will be of interest to the Senate.

It is, as I mentioned, the first general omnibus bill since 1962.

It would authorize a total of 109 flood control, navigation, beach erosion control, and mutliple-purpose improvements, having a total estimated cost of $1.9 billion.

A portion of this cost will be returned to the Federal Treasury in payments for water supply and recreation by local interests.

The storage space in Federal reservoirs allocated to water supply and recreation—would be paid for by local interests over a period of not to exceed 50 years.

On this basis—the net cost to the United States for construction of these projects would be $1.8 billion.

While the direct dollar return of the total cost of the projects in the bill would not be great—the overall benefits that will accrue to the Nation will more than offset the costs.

This, of course, does not take into account the human lives that will be saved due to flood protection measures, upon which we cannot place a dollar value.

Certain other functions of the projects, such as flood control and navigation, the cost of which is not reimbursable in cash to the Federal Government, nevertheless, will contribute to the economic growth of the country.

The funds thus expended would be eventually returned with interest to the general public in the form of increased purchasing power.

The $1.9 billion authorized in the bill does not represent spending for 1 year.

This amount will be budgeted over a period of years on a sound fiscal basis compatible with other needs of the country.

The bill contains works of improvement for construction in 38 States of the Union.

Surveys leading to future projects will be made in a number of other States, in accordance with language that the committee has seen fit to include in the bill.

Section 104 of the bill grants the consent of Congress to construction of a dam by the State of Pennsylvania on the Susquehanna River. This will result in no cost to the Federal Government.

Section 204 would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make loans to those local interests—located in designated depressed areas—who are unable to meet the required local contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects.

This will be a valuable provision to assist those communities located in economically depressed areas of the country.

Section 206 as well as 207—would provide for needed comprehensive water resource surveys throughout the Nation.

In closing—I especially wish to thank the members of the Public Works Committee who devoted long hours to the consideration and formulation of this bill.

Also, my appreciation is extended to Gen. Jackson Graham, the Director of Civil Works of the Corps of Engineers, and to his able staff for furnishing the committee with details on the various projects and matters.

I consider the pending bill to be a well conceived and carefully analyzed piece of water resource legislation, and highly recommend its passage.

Mr. President, I offer several amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The first two are in the form of technical amendments merely indicating document numbers for reports which have become available since the bill was reported by the committee.

The other amendment provides for authorization of the navigation project at Cedar River Harbor, Mich.

The amendment offered on this project meets the criteria the committee has set for other projects cleared since the committee met.

The project has the favorable recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and has been cleared by all Federal and State agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget.

The project is necessary in the interest of commercial and recreational fishing, and will also serve as a harbor of refuge. It has an exceedingly high benefit-cost ratio of 1.7 and is well justified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Page 25, line 8, insert the figure "244".

Page 25, line 16, insert the figure "246".

Page 4, following line 23, insert the following:

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;"

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered en bloc and, without objection, they are agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Senator McNAMARA, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, in asking that S. 2300 be passed by the Senate.

As the Senator from Michigan has said, the bill has been the subject of long and thorough consideration over a period of 4 months. The Committee on Public Works gave the bill close scrutiny in comprehensive hearings.

This year the chairman of the committee initiated a new system of hearings, which I believe was helpful and enabled the committee to give fuller consideration than was possible for each project in past years. The chairman established four subcommittees dealing with specific projects in the Atlantic regions, the central regions, the Mississippi-Plains regions, and the Pacific regions.

After the hearings in these special subcommittees had been completed, the full committee went over the bill, item by item, and it was reported unanimously by the Public Works Committee.

As the chairman has noted, the omnibus authorization bill is usually brought before the Senate biennially, but it has been 3 years since a regular omnibus Public Works bill has been before the

Senate. This, to a large extent, accounts for the authorization of $1,968,485,500 as reported in the bill developed by the committee.

There is always some criticism of this bill, chiefly from those who are not familiar with the careful processes fixed by law and Corps of Engineers regulations which must be followed before any project can be authorized by the Congress, or before appropriations can be provided for construction.

This is one of the cleanest omnibus bills that has been reported by a Public Works Committee. I do not know of any project included in the bill which has not met the requirements of the Corps of Engineers, the regulations of the Executive Department, or which is not in accord with law.

As those of us who serve on the committee know that every step provided by law and specific regulations must be met before the bill can be brought before the Senate. If a member considers a project to have merit, its survey by the Corps of Engineers must be ordered by a resolution of the Senate or House Public Works Committee. Then an appropriation for the survey must be provided to the Corps of Engineers by the Appropriations Committees and the Congress. When the survey has been completed by the district engineers, it must be approved at every level of the Corps of Engineers—the district engineer, the division engineer, the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors, the Chief of Engineers, and then by the Secretary of the Army—before it can be recommended to the Congress.

It must meet the cost-benefit ratio. The cost-benefit ratio prescribes that the benefits to be derived from a project must equal in value cost of the project, amortized either over a period of 50 years, or in some cases, 100 years. Every project in this bill meets the cost-benefit ratio.

Even after approval is granted at all levels of the Corps of Engineers, the project must have the approval of all interested departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and of the State governments concerned and, finally, the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, which actually is approval by the President of the United States, as the Bureau of the Budget is an office of the President of the United States.

This process takes a long time—sometimes years—before a particular project can be considered by the Congress for authorization and then appropriated. In that time, hearings have been held in the local areas, and hearings have been conducted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and by the Committee on Public Works of the House. No project is eligible for appropriations until all these steps have been satisfied.

I make this statement to describe the long process of approval and to answer the statement made by some, that the approval of river development projects of harbor improvements is a logrolling project or a porkbarrell bill.

This bill provides authorization for rivers and harbors projects, beach erosion projects, vital flood protection dam and reservoir projects, local flood protection projects, and navigation projects. In many cases, particularly with respect to local flood protection projects, a part of the cost of the project is borne by the community deriving the benefit from the specific project.

There is always some controversy about power projects. Some power projects are included in the bill, but they are few in number. They, too, have been justified in the same way that I have described in my remarks. Usually these hydroelectric projects are a part of multipurpose projects, providing flood protection and navigation benefits and are usually used for what is known as peaking power.

The witnesses who have testified before us—both on behalf of the Corps of Engineers and also private utility companies—stated that hyrdoelectric projects are the most useful and economical in the supply of peaking power.

In addition, the projects in this bill, in connection with those now under construction, will conserve precious water for human and industrial use, improve water quality, and furnish recreational benefits and conserve wildlife.

I do not need to remind Senators of the great floods which ravage this country every year. In recent months we were saddened by the terrible floods in the West—in Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho. They are repeated every year in my State, and all over the country, resulting in the loss of millions of dollars in property and, year after year, in the loss of human life.

I have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Public Works since 1957, and in these years I have been fortunate to see great progress made in the water resources programs affecting my own State of Kentucky, and I know the importance these programs have all across the Nation. I have been pleased to introduce in the Senate resolutions that ordered and initiated surveys of needed flood control projects in the river valleys of Kentucky. These resolutions have resulted in authorization and in construction of floodwalls, dams and reservoirs to protect the people and the communities in the river valleys of Kentucky.

Some of these resolutions initiated projects included in this bill before the Senate today. Other surveys are being made, and when completed will be recommended to the Congress. The development of the water resources of Kentucky has meant much to the saving of lives, the preservation of property, and to economic growth of Kentucky.

It has been a privilege to work with my colleagues on the Senate Public Works Committee, and my colleague in the Senate, Senator MORTON, and the members of the Kentucky congressional delegation in the House of Representatives.

The improvement and development of our rivers brings protection to communities and cities against floods. Having served on the Committee on Public Works for several years, I know that this program along with the navigation program, is one of the great factors in the economic development and growth of our country. It is of immense value to private industry, which bears the chief burden for the economic development and growth of our country.

So, today, I again wish to congratulate the chairman, the members, and the staff of the committee for their very careful consideration of the bill. The majority and the minority worked hard together, and I know that Senators FONG, BOGGS, PEARSON, and MURPHY join me in appreciation for the attention and consideration given by the committee to this bill.

I believe the bill is one which stands uniquely, the test of the criteria imposed by the Corps of Engineers, the agencies in the executive branch of the Government, the Committee on Public Works, and the Congress itself. I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee for his timely remarks. His remarks indicate the spirit of the Committee on Public Works. His cooperation has been greatly appreciated by all of us on the committee.

Mr. President, I had a commitment to yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] at this time. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

BIG SANDY RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES; PANTHER CREEK RESERVOIR IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I share the interest expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in the projects brought into the bill as a consequence of the Corps of Engineers' report on the Big Sandy River and its tributaries.

I especially commend the effective work done by Representative JAMES KEE, in whose district one of these projects would be located. Representative KEE has worked very diligently to advance flood control for the Big Sandy River and its tributaries.

It is pertinent that I point out, however, that although the need for flood protection and other water resource measures is of high priority in the Tug Fork watershed of the Big Sandy basin in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia, the major emphasis in this bill is on the Levisa Fork in Kentucky.

We are grateful, nevertheless, for the inclusion of the Panther Creek Reservoir proposal at an estimated cost of $11.3 million. This impoundment in McDowell County, W. Va., would provide important flood protection in the local area and would have a beneficial effect on flooding in the main stream of the Tug Fork River. Moreover, it would offer substantial recreational benefits to a recreation-starved section of Appalachia in a three-States corridor which includes portions of Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia.

But, Mr. President, the Tug Valley obtains very little of the considerable flood protection, water quality control, and low flow augmentation that it needs, especially along the main stem of the Tug Fork River.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in taking action on the Big Sandy Basin report and recommending the Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoirs, as well as a Martin, Ky., local protection project, also recommended as follows:

That the Knox Creek Reservoir (at either the upper or alternate lower sites), and the Pond Creek and Matewan local protection projects, which approach marginal economic justification but are not presently eligible for recommendation, be included in the basin plan, and that these projects be studied in connection with programs pertaining to Appalachia or other enacted legislation which may evolve.

I sincerely hope that the studies recommended by the Board, and such other actions as may be necessary, will be taken to bring forth a favorable report which will result in the provision of flood protection for the main Tug Valley from Knox Creek to confluence with the Levisa Fork in a not-too-distant year.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD in connection with these remarks certain quotations from testimony given by Mr. Everett Thompson, a resident and former delegate to the West Virginia Legislature from Mingo County, W. Va., concerning flood problems and flood control needs in the Tug Valley.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Tug Valley had a major flood in 1957 and in 1963, and we were saved from another one last year on March 26 by a lull of 7 hours in the rainfall as this gave time for the water to run off, and this prevented the flood. The Corps of Engineers has recommended the Panther Creek Reservoir which would lower our flood crest by a half to 2 feet.

We feel that, with the construction of a spur line up Peter Creek by the N. & W. Railroad connecting into their area in Buchanan County, Va., that the cost-benefit ratio for Lower Knox Creek would be favorable and, with this in mind, we have asked for a meeting with railroad officials hoping that something can be worked out where this can be accomplished.

The cost of constructing a railroad Y at the mouth of Knox Creek would tend to be a major part of the cost involved in the relocation of the Knox Creek railway line. This Y would span Tug River at an elevation of 150 feet above the stream and would permit coal to be hauled in either direction, east or west. If the Peter Creek line of the N. & W. Railway Co. could be used in conjunction with a connecting link into Buchanan County, Va., this would be above the maximum pool level of the proposed Lower Knox Creek Reservoir. We feel a comparable Y could be constructed at the mouth of Peter Creek to substitute for the Y at the mouth of Knox Creek. The Y at the mouth of Peter Creek would be at a lower elevation over the river, thus at a great reduction in construction cost.

The amount and grade of coal which would be affected has been stressed to some extent by the opponents of the proposed Lower Knox Creek Reservoir; however, the amount and grade of the coal which is recoverable are subjects which require exhaustive professional determination, and, at this point in the matter, any statements made are merely self-serving declarations.

It cannot be too strongly stressed that the lower Knox Creek Dam, if constructed, will be a benefit to the entire Tug Valley extending from the site of the dam to Fort Gay, W. Va., and the Big Sandy Valley from Fort Gay to Kenova, W. Va. All of the remarks made by the opposition seemed to be limited to Williamson and Matewan whereas it must be borne in mind that we are not dealing merely with the small town of Matewan and the not too much larger town of Williamson, both in West Virginia. There has also been mention made of the Williamson floodwall.

In spite of the existence of the Williamson floodwall, when there is high water, the city of Williamson is forced to expend large sums of money to replace and renew waterlines which extend from the West Virginia side and the city of Williamson's water system to the residents of a vast area of Pike County, Ky., including, but not limited to, the Appalachian Regional Hospital located in South Williamson and in which the Federal Government, through various agencies thereof, has invested many millions of dollars. Since the construction of the Williamson floodwall, Williamson has installed and put into operation a sewage disposal and treatment system with the aid and assistance of more than $600,000 in Federal funds, and this system includes sewage service furnished to the Appalachian Regional Hospital Association, requiring the extension of sewerlines to serve South Williamson and adjacent housing and pumping stations across Tug River from West Virginia into Kentucky. These lines will be washed out unless some additional measure of flood protection, over and above the Panther Creek Dam, is provided. The loss to Williamson alone by almost any amount of high water will bring untold financial hardships on the municipality. It must be borne in mind, and cannot be overstressed, that the Williamson municipal corporation has invested in its water and sewage system more than $2 million.

A comment on the Williamson floodwall, which has more than $850,000 in Federal money tied up in steel and concrete along the bank of Tug River for a short distance of the borderline of the municipal corporation, and also has $185,000 in municipal funds tied up in land and right-of-way, making a total of more than $1 million in Federal and municipal funds in a floodwall which in the 1963 flood did not provide flood protection for the small section of Williamson which it was supposed to serve. The floodwall is of a cantilever type of construction and if the floodwaters are ever permitted to get behind the wall, as they threatened to do in 1963, and did do to some extent, then the Williamson floodwall is completely lost and all of the funds invested are lost, as well as all of the property it is intended to serve. The construction of the lower Knox Creek Dam will eliminate all of these possibilities. During the 1963 flood, the Army Engineers hurried to Williamson and were constantly on hand during the main flooding threat, observing the floodwall in every detail, and wringing their hands. The municipality was informed afterward by the Engineers that the floodwall could not be raised, and this is a matter of record.

In view of the above remarks, it appears clear to the people of the Tug Valley that unless the Knox Creek Dam is constructed, there will be no flood protection whatever in the Tug Valley which is adequate.

During two major floodings, in a period of 6 years, traffic using the Norfolk & Western facilities from east to west and west to east was entirely halted for several days because of major flooding in the N. & W. facilities, including the yards and the tunnel which is located in the west end of the community. Since that time, the N. & W. has expanded even greater and their traffic from east to west and west to east, using these same facilities, has increased manifold, and today the N. & W. is breaking all records in coal loadings for shipments for all figures used prior to this date are now obsolete.

I would like to say that the money which is used in construction of the proposed lower Knox Creek Reservoir will return to the Government many times because of the additional industry that will be furnishing jobs for those who are now drawing welfare, unemployment, and so forth.

The question of water supply came up this morning. I would just like for the record to note that the city of Williamson last year had to build several small dams at different locations in Tug River before there was ample water for the citizens of Williamson, and I have had several businessmen who are in the well-drilling business tell me that they have had to go 10 to 15 feet deeper in the past few years to find water. There are wells that never went dry before that will no longer furnish water in the dry months of the summer and autumn seasons.

AMENDMENT NO. 364

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 364, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, following line 4, change the period to a comma and add the following:

Provided, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further*, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further*, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, before addressing myself very briefly to the amendment, I wish, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, to commend the most capable chairman, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for his consideration of the many projects incorporated in the authorization bill for rivers and harbors, flood control, and multiple purpose uses.

I wish also to commend the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and all other members of the committee, who have worked diligently during the hearings, and who listened for hours to explanations of projects and considered the pending projects in close detail. In the words of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], they have presented to the Senate a clean bill. I understand exactly what the Senator means when he so designates the proposed legislation.

The bill has been gone over very carefully. That is the background of the amendment which I now have offered to the Senate.

In West Virginia we have had a project known as the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, which in one way or another

has been pending for 30 years. I knew the project when I was in the House of Representatives. It is a project to which there have been from time to time various types of vigorous opposition.

The Rowlesburg Reservoir proposal in S. 2300 is the culmination of studies of the Cheat River and tributaries in West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania dating back more than three decades. It is a project which has been locally controversial, but nationally necessary. I speak of it as being nationally necessary because it is one of the vital impoundments proposed in the Appalachian highlands to hold back floodwaters and lessen the dangers in the industrially important Monogahela and Ohio River valleys. And it is needed equally as much to provide low flow augmentation when summer and autumn droughts so seriously affect both the Monongahela and the Ohio. Also of vital importance in the Rowlesburg Reservoir proposal are the water quality control and recreation benefits, and the pumped-storage capacity to enhance the power potential.

There has been opposition over the years in the impoundment area, as we must naturally expect in projects of this nature. There has been some opposition from conservation forces usually heard against high dams. And there has been opposition to development of the hydroelectric potential. But these classes of opposition have largely disappeared, with the contesting forces being almost exclusively those of the impoundment area.

Wildlife and conservation objection largely gave way to the concept that the reservoir is vitally needed as a part of the national system of water resource facilities.

The former antihydroelectric opposition has disappeared as the technology of power generation and the markets for power have changed in the region. As a matter of fact, investor-owned utilities and coal interests now look with favor on a Rowlesburg Reservoir. The electric company serving the area has made application to the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct and operate the pumped-storage power facilities of the project.

We overlooked this factor in committee when we recommended that the Rowlesburg Reservoir be authorized at the full estimated cost of $133 million plus, including Government power development.

Inasmuch as the Monongahela Power application is pending before the FPC, the administration has expressed a view that I share—and which I believe the chairman of our committee and other colleagues of the committee likewise share—that in authorizing the Rowlesburg project at this time we should restrict the construction of the power features until such time as action is taken by the Federal Power Commission.

This is the purpose of the amendment, but we have made it broad enough to—

First. Provide that the power features of the project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project.

Second. Provide further that, should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of the project shall be reduced to $88,402,000 from the $133 million figure in the bill.

Third. Provide further, however, that in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending application, Fedral construction of such pumped-storage power facilities would be authorized and approved.

We should not prohibit in this bill the processing of any application for a license pending before the Federal Power Commission. I will state candidly to my colleagues that the Bureau of the Budget expedited the clearance of this project to the Congress with the understanding and the strong recommendation that there be the restrictions on construction of the power features as proposed in my amendment. I also want the RECORD to reflect the constant support and effective assistance which my colleagues, Senator ROBERT BYRD and Representative HARLEY STAGGERS, have given in bringing this project to its present stage of authorization.

I feel that all rights and interests, including that of the Government, are properly and adequately protected by the amendment numbered 364 as printed and called up by me. For the reasons given, I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the committee has no objection to the inclusion of this amendment in the bill permitting the Federal Power Commission to consider applications for private development of the pump-storage power at the Rowlesburg Dam since an application for a license is now pending before that agency. However, it should be clearly understood that the Federal Power Commission would be expected to carefully analyze the situation as to whether it is in the best interests of the country to allow private interests to develop this site or whether it should be a Federal development.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am in full accord with the observation of our chairman.

Mr. McNAMARA. With that understanding, unless there is some objection on the part of the minority, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I should like to have the Senator from West Virginia assure the Senate that the amendment would not give any direction to the Federal Power Commission as to whether or not there should be public or private power in that area.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There is no such direction in the amendment, and there was no such intended direction or implication by the Senator from West Virginia. I assure the distinguished Senator from Montana, as I have assured the distinguished chairman of the committee, that there is in nowise an attempt to direct or coerce a decision in that respect.

Mr. METCALF. The proposal is merely an attempt to maintain the status quo in order that the Federal Power Commission can be fully free to arrive at a decision at its own discretion.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is entirely correct.

Mr. METCALF. I have no further objection.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Montana. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 362

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 362 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

In the proper place immediately preceding the section entitled "Rahway River Basin, New Jersey," add the following:

"ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized susbtantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered — Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Corps of Engineers had not submitted a full report on the Elizabeth River flood control project at the time of the hearings. Also, not all the other departments concerned had reported on the project at the time of the executive session of the Committee on Public Works. Since then, all the affected departments have reported on this flood control project, so desperately needed on the Elizabeth River, and their reports are favorable.

The project has been cleared by the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Public Health Service of New Jersey, and the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, who has done magnificent work on this highly complex bill, is familiar with the project and, I believe understands the need as expressed by the various departments and as I know it intimately, of course, because the project is in my State.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the committee has no objection to the inclusion of this project in the bill. It has been favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers; and all the Federal agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, have recommended it. The project is necessary to prevent hurricane flooding in the highly developed Elizabeth River basin and has a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I join other members of the Committee on Public Works in complimenting the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I have the pleasure of serving on this committee. I know of the time that these two distinguished Senators have devoted to the public works bill. What I say of them is true also of the other members of the committee.

I also compliment the entire staff of the committee, because they have done a vast amount of work in preparing the bill for the Senate. Many hours of work have gone into its completion. As the Senator from Kentucky has said, 4 months of work have gone into the preparation of the bill, and it is a good, clean bill.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to authorize a project that has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget since the Committee on Public Works acted on the omnibus bill.

The project involves the deepening of the Cape Fear River Channel above Wilmington, N.C., between Wilmington and Acme, N.C. The total cost of the project to the United States for construction dredging is $1,510,000. The project has an estimated benefit-cost ratio of 1.7 to 1.

The Corps of Engineers has been reviewing this project for the past 4 years. It is one which all interested agencies of the Federal Government and State and local governments have approved. I sincerely hope the Senate will approve the project as an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, following line 10, insert the following:

"Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;".

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment is agreeable to the committee. It has a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.7 and has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and approved by all interested Federal and State agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget. The project will improve navigation conditions on the Cape Fear River.

There being no objection to the amendment by any member of the committee, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 6, following line 7, insert the following:

"Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I make a brief statement on the amendment, I wish to make a few personal comments. I know that the Senator from Michigan never likes to hear compliments. I sometimes think that were one to compliment the Senator from Michigan, he might be a little suspicious. Nevertheless, the people of Michigan, who sent him here, are deserving of the respect that I pay to them through my comments on the Senator from Michigan. I have worked closely with the Senator from Michigan on other committees and have found him to be a delightful colleague.

I thank him for his fairness, his thoroughness, and his keen foresight in regard to the facts that involve problems such as the one raised by my amendment.

I thank him sincerely for the leadership he has given in bringing to the Senate what the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] referred to as a clean public works bill. The Senator from Kentucky and I have worked together in the Senate for more years than we sometimes like to admit—and on both sides of the aisle. I served with the Senator from Kentucky for many years on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; in fact, we served together as members of the Subcommittee on Education and also on the Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement. So I know whereof I speak when I say that the Senator from Kentucky, as is also true of the Senator from Michigan, asks only one question, "What are the facts, and what can you say in support of the facts?"

On the basis of that premise, I urge the acceptance of my amendment. I spoke with the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Kentucky about the amendment prior to the reporting of the bill to the Senate. We had been waiting for some time to receive a report and the final papers from the Corps of Engineers. They were received after the bill had been reported to the Senate.

The amendment is in proper form. It relates to a jetty at Tillamook, Ore. The report of the Army Engineers shows how essential it is to eliminate the great annual waste and loss suffered by property owners in that area each year.

I offer the amendment on its merits. The chairman and ranking minority member of the committee are familiar with the merits.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon on this project is agreeable to the committee. The project has a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.3. It has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and approved by all interested Federal and State agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget. The project will improve navigation conditions at Tillamook Bay. Therefore, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be started.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 9, strike the period at the end thereof and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to solve a problem that exists in my State of Iowa, and more particularly in the State conservation commission of Iowa, with regard to the project in the Big Sioux River. The difficulty is outlined in the committee report.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the committee report on page 147 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comments of the States and Federal agencies:

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of South Dakota: Favorable.

State of Iowa: Does not concur in fish and wildlife mitigation plan. Have expressed the view that the report should be delayed pending results of authorized study of upstream reservoirs. It is the view of the Chief of Engineers that the proposed project will be compatible with, and enhanced by, any future flood control plan that might be developed for the upper basin, and will not become redundant as a result of any upstream reservoirs that may later be authorized and built. It is his further view that this proposed project will not bar consideration of other projects which may be developed in the basin in the future. He therefore recommends authorization of the project without further delay. If the project is authorized, the corps will continue coordination with concerned interests during advanced planning with a view to developing a mutually agreeable fish and wildlife mitigation plan.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget: No objection.

Remarks: The committee notes that the State of South Dakota favors the project. Also, that a preponderance of affected local interests in the area to be protected favor the project, but the State of Iowa does not concur completely in the plan. The committee believes the project is a worthy undertaking, but that in its planning and design phases continued effort should be made to develop a project mutually agreeable, insofar as possible, to all concerned.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Governor of Iowa, the Hon. Harold E. Hughes, to the Senator from Michigan. This letter indicates that he is not objecting to a portion of the project, but is objecting to another portion of the project.

My amendment would permit the first portion of the project to proceed as planned, and would make the start on the second portion of the project con-

tingent upon the States of Iowa and South Dakota agreeing to the fish and wildlife conservation plan and the upper flood control basin plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the Senator from Michigan from the Governor of Iowa under date of April 13, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 13, 1965.

Hon. PAT MCNAMARA,
U.S. Senator Chairman, Public Works Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCNAMARA: In view of the great national concern for the conservation of our natural resources, promotion and development of outdoor recreation and the mounting emphasis toward sound integrated resource planning, I, as Governor of Iowa, wish to be officially on record as opposing the straightening of the Big Sioux River from Akron to Sioux City, as proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

As an alternative, I urge that this subcommittee consider favorably a program which is more consistent with modern concepts of conservation. This would involve complete watershed development for the Big Sioux River Basin, including main stream impoundments, subimpoundments, and reclamation of drained marshes, plus other sound practices involved in water and soil conservation. By such a program, a broad cross-section of our taxpayers would benefit from the expenditure of public funds.

I support the proposed channel improvement within the city limits of Sioux City, but I strongly urge that the channel straightening project as proposed by the Corps of Engineers for the Akron to Sioux City reach of the Big Sioux be rejected.

Your consideration of this letter will be deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD E. HUGHES,
Governor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the State conservation commissioner of Iowa has indicated in a letter under date of April 9, 1965, that he is opposed to the particular portion of the project to which I have referred.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 9, 1965.

IOWA CONSERVATION COMMISSION'S OBJECTIONS TO STRAIGHTENING THE BIG SIOUX RIVER

Senator PAT MCNAMARA,
Chairman, Public Works Committee, New Senate office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The State Conservation Commission of Iowa hereby objects to the straightening of the Big Sioux River between the town of Akron and Sioux City, as proposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This objection is based upon detrimental effects that would accrue to the fisheries, wildlife and associated recreational values of this river.

The State law that provided for a conservation commission sets out the following general duty, "It shall be the duty of the commission to protect, increase, preserve the fish, game, fur-bearing animals and protect birds of the State." Also, "Matters relating to State waters, State parks, forest and forestry, and lakes and streams, including matters related to scenic, scientific, historical, archeological, and recreational matters."

All wild game and fish are the property of the State and every citizen has his share of ownership. The above law is a mandate to the conservation commission to protect and preserve fish and game and to insure that all streams are considered in their scenic and recreational uses for all the people of Iowa.

Numerous examples of the catastrophic biological effects of stream straightening on fish and game may be cited. Portions of the Little Sioux, Skunk, Upper Iowa, Des Moines, Nishnabotna, Nodaway, and many other rivers have been virtually ruined from the standpoint of fishing and hunting and other outdoor recreation by virtue of straightening. The elimination of river bends or oxbows from the flowage eliminates environmental conditions conducive to welfare of fishes and game that are endemic to the stream basin. Esthetic values associated with a meandering-type stream are lost by straightening and channelization.

It is most difficult to ascribe economic values to wildlife, fisheries, and recreation. Intangibles are involved which transcend cash money evaluations, but are recognized as true values nevertheless. Minimal figures have therefore been ascribed to the annual fish, game, and water losses involved in this project, if completed. Calculated as follows:

Deer	$612.00
Raccoon	109.76
Beaver	547.25
Squirrel	661.50
Cottontails	423.00
Pheasants	150.00
Mink	93.42
Muskrats	894.87
Canada geese	250.00
Blue and snow geese	500.00
Ducks	3,000.00
Fish	23,000.00
Water surface area	24,000.00
Annual loss	54,241.00

The 50-year amortization figure used by the Corps of Engineers—appendix II, page 6—in "The Review Report on Flood Control for Big Sioux River and Tributaries Iowa and South Dakota, Reports and Appendixes, U.S. Army Engineer District, Omaha, Nebr., October 1960," may be used to indicate the magnitude of recreational loss in the same period. Multiplying the annual loss of $54,241.00 by 50, we have $2,612,090. The loss of wildlife habitat caused by the probable clearing of timber, shrubs, and forbs, calculated at $100 per acre for the 5,647 acres involved in this stretch of river means an additional loss of $564,700. This amount added to the accrued deficits gives a total of $3,176,790 as the total of these values alone for a 50-year period. It does not include esthetic recreational intangibles such as picknicking, nature hikes, bird watching, and other values inherent in a natural meandering stream as compared to the practically negligible values of a straight ditch.

It is the contention of the Iowa Conservation Commission; South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Department; National, State, and local chapters of the Izaak Walton League of America; National Wildlife Federation and its local affiliates; plus the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners that the straightening of streams as a means of flood control is not compatible with modern concepts of good resource management. All agree that watershed controls including impoundments and subimpoundments on the main stem and tributaries in the watershed, plus other recognized water and soil conservation practices constitutes more effective control of floods. It also retains and enhances the fisheries, wildlife, and recreational features endemic to the river basin. Iowa has many hundreds of miles of straightened rivers which provide practically no outdoor recreation. The elimination of fish and game habitat automatically degrades the environment for these animals and at the same time abolishes the scenic attraction for those in search of outdoor recreation.

The State Conservation Commission of Iowa recognizes that flood control is needed by the farmers in the lower flood plain of the Big Sioux; however, it is the contention of this body that the mitigation of floods by channel straightening is inimicable to modern concepts of conservation of natural resources. The long-range planning for the Nation's needs of soil, water, and recreation must include the saving of water, soil, and recreational areas. Our Nation's leading ecologists have warned repeatedly of the dangers to our civilization, if we continue the abues of natural resources. The plundering of soils, waters, and recreational areas by river straightening to benefit a few individuals at public expense is inconsistent with and in diametric opposition to these postulates.

In conclusion we respectfully call your attention to several other factors which seem germane to any decision concerning this project:

1. The Big Sioux River is a meandered stream and therefore the property of the State of Iowa from midchannel to the left bank (Iowa side).

2. The Big Sioux River constitutes the boundary between Iowa and South Dakota (act of Congress, August 4, 1846, and constitution of Iowa).

3. The proposed channel change would place 1,610 acres of Iowa land in South Dakota and 760 acres of South Dakota land in Iowa. This represents a 850-acre loss of Iowa land to the State of South Dakota unless our Constitution is amended. The boundary of Iowa can be enlarged by an act of Congress and the general assembly. There is no provision for reducing it. The corps proposes to do the work first and obtain approval by these bodies afterward (p. 32, 1960 report).

4. Using the corps figures (Appendix III—23, 1960 report) the costs exceed the value of the benefited lands (34,000 acres at $200 = $6,800,000).

5. In calculating the cost-benefit ratio the Corps of Engineers did not include any mitigation for losses to fisheries, wildlife, or recreation. If these annual losses cited previously in this report were included, the cost-benefit ratio would be less than 1:1 or 1:0.93 (corps calculations, p. 28, 1960 report). This does not include the cost of the loss of wildlife habitat worth over a half million dollars. Thus the costs far exceed the benefits.

Finally, the State Conservation Commission urges this subcommittee of the Congress to look with favor upon the plan very recently drafted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, for a comprehensive Big Sioux River Basin study in South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa. This proposed study is designed to develop a water resources management plan for the Big Sioux River Basin. It involves coordinating arrangements with the Department of the Army (Corps of Engineers), Department of Agriculture, Department of Interior, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, plus 21 State agencies from South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa. These agencies would serve in a sponsoring position and assume the leadership for coordination, development, and activation of an integrated program to appraise, conserve, and efficiently utilize the Big Sioux Basin's water and related land resources to meet all long-term needs. With such a program, a broad spectrum of our taxpayers would benefit from the expenditure of public funds.

For the Director:

E. T. ROSE,
Chief, Fish and Game Division, Iowa Conservation Commission.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Department of the Army under date of July 26, 1965, indicating that extensive discussions and inquiries among several members of his staff have failed to disclose any instance of congressional authorization of any civil works project in the face of disapproval by the Governor of an affected State.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1965.

HON. JACK MILLER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MILLER: I have your recent inquiry as to whether or not the Congress has authorized a flood control project which has been disapproved by the Governor of an affected State.

As discussed in a telephone conversation between representatives of our respective offices, a conclusive negative would require research over a considerable period of time. However, extensive discussions and inquiries among several members of my staff have failed to disclose any instance of congressional authorization of any civil works project in the face of disapproval by the Governor of an affected State.

Sincerely yours,

JACKSON GRAHAM,
Major General, U.S. Army,
Director of Civil Works.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my amendment would be to let the program go forward.

I am satisfied that, if the bill is passed with my amendment contained therein, the States of Iowa and South Dakota will devise a plan that will be mutually acceptable to them with respect to the present disputed portions.

I hope that the chairman of the committee will see fit to accept my amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, unless there is objection to the amendment, the chairman has no objection. If the author of the amendment wishes to move that the amendment be agreed to, I shall not object.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read but printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 35, between lines 12 and 13, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 208. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this Act any authorization of any project pursuant to such provisions shall not be effective if the benefit-cost ratio of such project contained in the report on such project by the Chief of Engineers is less than 1.51."

On page 36, line 13, strike out "SEC. 208" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 209".

WASTE IN FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to remove from the public works bill now under consideration projects which are not economically justified. The amendment would cut $845 million out of the bill. Although many projects in the bill are worthwhile ones which would pay back the public investment put into them, there are other projects in the bill which are not worthwhile. These wasteful projects should be eliminated.

This is not the first time I have spoken in this Chamber on the subject of the benefits and costs involved in public works projects. On August 9, 1962, I urged implementation of realistic congressional standards for evaluating proposed Federal projects. On December 24, 1963, I discussed the work of Prof. Robert Haveman, the highly respected economist who had just completed a lengthy study of economic efficiency in postwar programs carried out by the Corps of Engineers. I had printed, for the consideration of other Senators, an article by Professor Haveman analyzing deficiencies in the current methods of determining benefit-cost ratios. On June 19, 1963, I introduced a resolution which would have been a first step toward realistic standards and which would have made the executive branch aware of the Senate's insistence that realistic standards be applied so that the taxpayer would know just what he is being asked to pay for.

At the heart of all discussion on the worth of Federal projects is the benefit-cost ratio. It is, at first glance, a very simple thing. It is obtained by adding up the monetary value of all benefits and of all costs which will be connected with a given project. Annual benefits and annual costs are obtained by dividing by the number of years the project will contribute to the economy. The actual benefit-cost ratio is then obtained by dividing annual costs or charges into annual benefits. If costs and benefits are equal, the ratio is one, or unity. If benefits exceed costs, the ratio is greater than unity. If benefits are less than costs, the ratio is less than unity.

The important thing, however, is that every cost and every benefit used in arriving at the ratio be accurate and justifiable. It is a regrettable fact that at the present time a number of spurious benefits are often used in arriving at the benefit-cost ratio. It is also a fact that costs are often computed at an unrealistically low level.

Two major elements in determining costs of long-term investment, as any homeowner knows, are interest rates and the length of time allowed for repayment. Previously I have pointed out that it would be utopian for a private citizen to expect to pay for his house at an interest rate of 2½ or 3 percent and to have as long as 100 years to pay. Yet, these are the assumptions which form the basis for estimating costs of investment in many Federal projects. All this amounts to gross deception. Costs of Federal projects appear far lower than they really are. If anyone wonders who loses, it is that forgotten person, the American taxpayer.

To give credit where credit is due, current executive branch policy is to use as the interest rate for Federal projects the average rate of interest payable on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States having terms of maturity of at least 15 years. Right now this rate is 3⅛ percent. This policy, however, has not yet trickled down to affect cost computations of projects now coming to Congress for approval. Interest rates for most projects in the present bill are set at 3 percent—although some projects have rates as low as 2½ percent. And in view of the fact that the Federal Government is now borrowing at more than 4 percent, why should not at least 4 percent be the discount rate? The answer, Mr. President, is that at 4 percent many of these projects would be lost. It would be proved that the costs would be greater than the benefits.

The effect of this unreasonably low interest rate is to make many unreasonable projects appear reasonable. My amendment would eliminate most, if not all, of such projects.

Turning to the benefit side of the benefit-cost ratio, it becomes apparent that several categories of benefits now included are spurious. Congressional policy on this score has become more lax in the last decade. In 1951, a House Appropriations subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions, reported to the House Appropriations Committee about a proposed Corps of Engineers project as follows:

It was evident to Congress from this report that the project could not be justified by the statutory criterion, a favorable benefit-cost ratio, unless intangible and arbitrary values such as national defense ($600,000), enhancement of local land values ($275,000), and recreation ($100,000), were included in the ratio. In congressional hearings and debates, Senators and Congressmen objected to these intangibles, and they have been dropped in subsequent consideration of the project.

The proposed project happened to be the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, a project which has by no means been laid to rest even now. In 1947, the Corps of Engineers had reported a benefit-cost ratio of 1.13, in other words, annual benefits were said to be 1.13 times greater than annual costs. The House subcommittee found, once the items mentioned in the paragraph had been eliminated, that the actual ratio was only 0.27. In other words, benefits were actually only 27 percent or less than one-third of costs. Phony benefit items made the difference between fiction and reality.

Mr. President, fiction is still with us today. Land enhancement benefits and recreation benefits, neither of which provide monetary returns to the economy, appear in profusion in the report accompanying the present bill. The land enhancement benefit item is especially vulnerable. Those economists, such as Professor Haveman, who have studied the matter are unanimous in stating that increased appraised values

are "paid for" by project construction costs—they do not enter the economy as a separate benefit. Furthermore, in cases where land enhancement benefits are claimed to result from transportation improvements, there are corresponding reductions in land values in the places from which the traffic is diverted. In such cases, reduction in one place cancels out benefits in another.

No less than 16 projects in the present bill have land enhancement benefits claimed as part of their justification. In most cases, the benefit claimed is small, for example 1 percent of benefits claimed for Edmonds Harbor, Washington; 2 percent of benefits claimed for Kawaihae Harbor in Hawaii; and 2 percent of benefits claimed for the Maumee River Basin project in Ohio.

In a few cases, however, the land enhancement benefit claimed is extremely large. Two flood control projects in California, the Eel River project and the Napa River Basin project, are justified largely on the basis of land enhancement benefits, which, as I have said, are condemned by economists as a fake benefit. For the Eel River project, 44 percent of annual benefits are said to be in land enhancement. For the Napa River Basin project the figure is 39 percent. With the spurious land enhancement benefit included, the benefit-cost ratio for Eel River is 1.1 and for the Napa River Basin it is 1.5.

Mr. President, when the phony benefit item is eliminated, the benefit-cost ratio for both projects falls to less than unity. For Eel River the ratio becomes 0.62, and for the Napa River Basin it becomes 0.90. These are the real benefit-cost ratios which should be put before this Chamber and before the American taxpayer. My amendment would remove both projects from the present bill.

Another unjustifiable project, Mr. President, is the proposed project for the Grand River and tributaries in Missouri and Iowa. As part of this project, seven tremendously costly reservoirs are proposed. For the seven reservoirs the Federal taxpayer is being asked for $252,020,000—more than $1 from every man, woman, and child in this Nation. With such huge sums involved one would expect substantial benefit-cost ratios for the reservoirs, with every benefit item thoroughly examined and 100 percent justifiable.

But what are the actual ratios?—see page 150 of report. For Mercer Reservoir the ratio claimed is 1.5. For Pattonsburg, Trenton, and Brookfield Reservoirs the ratio claimed is 1.3. For St. Catherine and Braymer Reservoirs the ratio claimed is 1.1. And I am almost embarrassed to tell you, Mr. President, that for the remaining reservoir, the Linneus Reservoir, the ratio claimed is exactly 1.

What about the benefit items used in arriving at the claimed ratios for these seven reservoirs? Is every one of them guaranteed to provide tangible benefits to the national economy? Not by a long shot. Thirty-two percent of the annual benefits claimed are intangible. The dollar figure is $3,600,000 annually for "recreation and fish and wildlife." I have nothing against recreation, Mr. President. Recreation areas are vitally needed. But let us be honest with ourselves. As the House subcommittee reported in 1951, recreation benefits, however valuable in the abstract, are intangible in terms of dollars and cents. We are being deluded if we let ourselves believe that a tangible monetary return will be provided from recreation which can properly be used to pay back taxpayers' dollars poured into these reservoirs in the Midwest and into the numerous other projects in the bill which are justified on the same ground. I need hardly add, Mr. President, that with these intangible benefits eliminated, the seven reservoirs have a benefit-cost ratio of less than unity.

The Department of Agriculture has expressed reservations about the adverse effects which some of these reservoirs would have on flood prevention and watershed protection.

GROSSLY INADEQUATE INFORMATION

Mr. President, something should be said about the information available to Senators about the bill we are now considering. Normally the bill itself and the report accompanying it give us most of the information we need to make an intelligent decision before casting our vote. In some cases further information, often in the form of House or Senate documents, is necessary to provide detailed information not presented in the report. Such is the case for the public works bill. For each project in the bill, a separate House or Senate document exists. These documents, most of which take the form of a "letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers," explain, or should explain, in detail the purposes and costs and benefits of the projects.

There are two points which should be made. The first is that a number of these documents are not yet printed. At least 13 House documents relating to specific projects in the bill now before us are not available. Before introducing my amendment to eliminate all the projects having a benefit-cost ratio of less than 1.51, I naturally tried to learn everything I could about such projects and the others in the bill.

I was dismayed to learn that detailed information about a number of projects is simply unavailable. As an example, one of the projects which we are being asked to approve is the seven reservoir project for the Grand River and its tributaries in Iowa and Missouri. We are being asked to approve no less than $252 million for these projects. It is one of the most expensive in the bill. Detailed information, we are told in the report accompanying the bill, is contained in House Document No. 241, 89th Congress. I have tried to obtain this document. It is not yet printed, or at least it was not yesterday afternoon. How can the Senate pass proper judgment on such a tremendous project without the primary documents relating to it? As I have said, other House documents which we should have before us are not yet printed either.

The other point which should be made concerns the actual documents themselves. The essential information which we seek in them concerns the justification for the various projects. We want to know exactly what benefits and costs will result, and we want to see how those benefits and costs have been obtained. In almost every case, this essential information is sketchy and incomplete. In these documents, which run from 20 to 100 pages, the benefit-cost information is given on one, two, or three pages. Often, as one seeks greater detail about the benefit-cost ratio, he is referred to the appendixes of the document. Time after time I have been frustrated to find that the appendix concerning the benefit-cost ratio is not included in the document. Even though it is listed in the table of contents, it is not printed as part of the document. For example, in Senate Document No. 94 of the 88th Congress, relating to the Perdido Pass Channel project in Alabama, the appendix entitled "Computation of Benefits" is not included in the document. The document contains fancy photographs and all sorts of charts, but the basic information about the benefit-cost ratio is not deemed worthy of inclusion.

Another example is provided by House Document No. 159 of this Congress relating to the Evanston, Ill., beach erosion control study. In this document the appendix concerning costs and benefits is the only appendix not printed in the document.

I could go on with all the other examples. I will provide the complete list to anyone who wishes to see it. It is a shocking situation, Mr. President, that all the essential information I have referred to should be unavailable as we consider this tremendously important bill.

Mr. President, I could go on at length about the unjustifiable benefit-cost ratios which we are asked to accept in this bill. My calculations have convinced me that for a project to be acceptable under present procedures, its benefit-cost ratio must be close to 2. In other words, benefits must appear to be almost twice as much as costs. And I have not mentioned the inevitable increases in costs which take place between the start and finish of Government projects.

My amendment would remove from the present bill all projects having a claimed benefit-cost ratio of less than 151. My amendment would not prevent restudies of the projects affected. My amendment would compel all questionable projects to be reexamined or abandoned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of projects provided for in the present bill which have a benefit-cost ratio of less than 1.51. The list shows the pertinent data for each project.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects having low benefit-cost ratios (S. 2300 public works authorizations fiscal year 1966 information from S. Rept. 464)

Page of S. Rept. 464	Project	Benefit-cost ratio	Annual Federal charges	Total Federal cost
	Navigation improvements:			
16	Alpena Harbor, Mich	1.4	$27,900	$895,000
17	Bayou La Batre channel, Alabama	1.1	36,000	262,000
25	Newport News-Norfolk channel	1.1	530,600	7,095,000
32	Frankfort Harbor, Mich	1.5	14,200	237,000
34	Hanalei Bay Harbor, Hawaii	1.3	36,500	347,000
34	Waianae Harbor, Hawaii	1.1	85,000	933,000
34	Kailua Harbor, Hawaii	1.5	34,600	244,000
34	Lahaina Harbor, Hawaii	1.4	32,900	364,000
34	Hana Harbor, Hawaii	1.2	88,200	1,679,000
43	Columbia River lock and dam, Washington and Oregon (John Day)	1.35	108,323	1,356,000
45	Lexington Harbor, Mich	1.2	30,500	563,000
52	New York Harbor	1.5	1,848,800	44,852,000
55	Perdido Pass channel, Alabama	1.4	94,000	625,000
57	Ponce de Leon Inlet channels, Fla	1.3	169,000	1,104,000
67	Savannah Harbor, Ga	1.3	401,000	7,112,000
	Beach erosion control projects:			
73	Newport, R.I	1.3	13,200	340,000
76	Evanston, Ill	1.5	15,300	392,000
77	Fort Pierce, Fla	1.3	45,800	220,000
80	Perth Amboy, N.J	1.2	4,200	82,000
	Flood control, hurricane protection, and multiple-purpose works:			
89	Danbury, Conn	1.2	75,000	2,300,000
93	Rockaway Inlet, N.Y	1.4	1,474,700	32,620,000
97	Rahway River, N.J	1.4	57,400	1,514,000
100	New Bern, N.C	1.1	423,900	10,400,000
101	Ocracoke Island, N.C	1.3	257,300	1,636,000
103	Flint River, Ga.:			
	Lazer Creek	1.2	2,158,000	40,378,000
	Lower Auchumpkee	1.3	2,397,000	48,275,000
109	Phillippi Creek Basin, Fla	1.3	195,500	4,592,000
118	Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana	1.3	182,400	5,500,000
129	White Oak Bayou, Tex	1.2	57,000	1,800,000
134	El Paso County, Tex.:			
	Central	1.1	231,300	[2] 7,310,000
	Southeast	1.2	58,200	[2] 1,839,000
138	John Redmond Reservoir, Kans	1.5	111,400	1,315,000
141	Walnut River, Kans.:			
	El Dorado Reservoir	1.2	[3] 2,321,900	23,300,000
	Towanda Reservoir	1.2		23,000,000
	Douglas Reservoir	1.2		18,200,000
143	Shidler Reservoir, Okla	1.2	258,000	6,150,000
148	Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers, Iowa and Missouri:			
	Reservoirs	1.2	203,600	5,280,000
	Channel improvements:			
	Mussel Fork	1.5	56,600	1,267,000
	Little Chariton	1.5	109,600	2,581,000
149	Grand River and tributaries, reservoirs, Missouri and Iowa:			
	Pattonsburg	1.3		
	Trenton	1.3		
	Mercer	1.5		
	Linneus	1.0	9,195,000	[3] 252,020,000
	Brookfield	1.3		
	St. Catherine	1.1		
	Braymer	1.1		
155	Sandy Lick Creek, Pa	[4] .9	66,100	1,654,000
159	Big South Fork, Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn	1.2	10,074,000	151,000,000
160	Big Sandy River and tributaries, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia:			
	Paintsville Reservoir	1.4	600,200	16,974,000
	Panther Creek Reservoir	1.1	417,200	11,094,000
172	Kaskaskia River levees, Illinois	1.4	344,000	8,940,000
173	Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa and Minn.:			
	Marshalltown	1.5	87,000	2,670,000
	Waterloo	1.2	492,800	14,900,000
175	Zumbro River, Minn	1.3	37,100	975,000
177	Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak	1.1	159,500	3,885,000
179	Maumee River Basin, Ohio	1.2	345,600	9,317,000
183	Grand River, Mich	1.2	49,600	1,373,000
184	Winslow, Ariz	1.4	104,000	2,775,000
189	Eel River, Calif	1.1	534,000	13,732,000
192	Sonoma Creek, Calif	1.1	374,000	9,400,000
193	Napa River Basin, Calif	1.5	473,500	14,950,000
195	Tahquitz Creek, Calif	1.3	96,000	3,030,000
196	San Diego River, Calif	1.2	462,000	14,600,000
197	Willow Creek, Oreg	1.2	233,100	[5] 4,345,000
	Amount cut by Proxmire amendment			845,393,000
	Bill total			1,968,485,500

[1] 1st costs.
[2] Total annual Federal charges.
[3] Total for 7 reservoirs.
[4] With area redevelopment benefits, 1.1.
[5] Net cost.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I should like to respond first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I withdraw my request.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, together with his statement, has some merit. I admit this at the outset. Everything the Senator said should be considered was considered by the agencies, especially by the Army Corps of Engineers. It is true, as the Senator from Wisconsin has stated, that some of these projects get down practically to parity—in other words, a 1-to-1 ratio.

The Senator made quite a point of the unavailability of certain documents. I assure him that in the files of the Public Works Committee we have every one of these reports from the agencies, and they will be made available to his staff any time they want to see them. I suggest that he consult the committee clerk. We have all the documents to which the Senator referred in our files.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate the Senator's statement. My staff tried to obtain the documents. The point I made is that they were not printed and were not generally available.

Mr. McNAMARA. The material and letters are available in our files.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My staff had some difficulty obtaining certain of these documents. I appreciate what the Senator from Michigan is saying.

Mr. McNAMARA. The idea of a benefit-cost ratio is very simple. If the benefits exceed the costs, the project is acceptable. To arbitrarily set a benefit-cost ratio higher than parity would be unfair and inconsistent with sound public policy. If there is something bad about the benefit-cost ratio as it is now used, let us replace it with something better. But let us not say that some projects are favorable when the benefits are more than the costs, but others are not. I am against that kind of principle.

Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope that it will be defeated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I join my good friend from Michigan in opposing the pending amendment.

For the past 14 years, I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Public works of the Committee on Appropriations. What we are considering now is merely an authorization. Before the money can be obtained, in order to proceed with the planning and construction of any of these projects, the Senate through the Appropriations Committee, will have ample opportunity to annually look into and study all the projects.

Oftentimes, some of the projects presented to the Public Works Committee had a low benefit-cost ratio, say something on the order of 1.4 or 1.1 to 1.0, but I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that there are very few projects that have been undertaken unless it could be shown that the benefits would exceed the costs.

For instance, of the many navigation projects that have been constructed, I can point to some in which the tonnage actually moved on the waterway was 13 times more than the estimates given when the project was first authorized. That situation applies to many projects.

Let me assure the Senator from Wisconsin that I shall in the future, as I have in the past, carefully review these projects before recommending any appropriations. As he knows, many projects, although authorized as long as 25 years ago, have not been provided with money, because the committee felt that the projects, although authorized, were not under present conditions economically justified, and so they were turned down.

Let me point out that Congress enacted Public Law 88–578, wherein authority was given to agencies of the Government to charge fees to visit recreational centers. The Public Works Committee in this bill has recommended projects in which certain amounts of money are required for recreation, let us say. Only a few months ago, Congress enacted a bill which established the policy that committees should take into consideration the benefits that would be derived from recreation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, at the end of my remarks, to have printed in the RECORD section 2 of Public Law 8972, which was signed by the President on July 9, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if it is necessary in order for a project to obtain the proper benefit-cost ratio to include recreational benefits, the local authorities must bind themselves to pay at least half of the separable cost of the recreational facilities. That is something new which has been added in the law passed this session. Before that time, recreation could be considered in a Corps of Engineers project and the Federal Government would put up the entire cost. Now, if it is necessary to have recreation, in order to make the benefit-cost ratio at least 1 to 1, under the law which was enacted a few weeks ago, it would be incumbent on the local people to put up at least half the cost for such items as acquiring the additional land, buildings, access roads, and other facilities required solely for recreation. The local people would be compelled to contribute at least half of that cost, which is an innovation compared to what it was in the past.

It is my belief that with the new law, and the authority given under Public Law 88–578 giving the agencies of Government the authority to charge fees for visiting recreation centers, it will go far toward paying a good deal of the cost of the recreational features of these projects.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be defeated. As I said, this is merely an authorization of the projects. Congress will have another opportunity to look more closely into the details, if and when the projects come up before the Appropriations Committee to provide the money.

Although the projects are authorized, we must provide funds for engineering and design before construction can start, at which time the Engineers will have another opportunity to study the project in detail, to be certain that the benefit-cost ratio is good, and one which will return benefits in excess of its costs.

It is my belief that with these two laws which I have cited, which have been recently adopted, and the fact that recreation centers are very popular today throughout the Nation, and are much needed, we need not fear that the Government will not get a proper return on its investment.

EXHIBIT 1

PUBLIC LAW 89–72

SEC. 2. (a) If, before authorization of a project, non-Federal public bodies indicate their intent in writing to agree to administer project land and water areas for recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement or for both of these purposes pursuant to the plan for the development of the project approved by the head of the agency having administrative jurisdiction over it and to bear not less than one-half the separable costs of the project allocated to either or both of said purposes, as the case may be, and all the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement incurred therefor—

(1) the benefits of the project to said purpose or purposes shall be taken into account in determining the economic benefits of the project;

(2) costs shall be allocated to said purpose or purposes and to other purposes in a manner which will insure that all project purposes share equitably in the advantages of multiple-purpose construction: *Provided*, That the costs allocated to recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement shall not exceed the lesser of the benefits from those functions or the costs of providing recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement benefits of reasonably equivalent use and location by the least costly alternative means; and

(3) not more than one-half the separable costs and all the joint costs of the project allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be borne by the United States and be nonreimbursable.

Projects authorized during the calendar year 1965 may include recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement on the foregoing basis without the required indication of intent. Execution of an agreement as aforesaid shall be a prerequisite to commencement of construction of any project to which this subsection is applicable.

(b) The non-Federal share of the separable costs of the project allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be borne by non-Federal interests, under either or both of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the head of the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the project: (1) payment, or provision of lands, interests therein, or facilities for the project; or (2) repayment, with interest at a rate comparable to that for other interest-bearing functions of Federal water resource projects, within fifty years of first use of project recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement facilities: *Provided*, That the source of repayment may be limited to entrance and user fees or charges collected at the project by non-Federal interests if the fee schedule and the portion of fees dedicated to repayment are established on a basis calculated to achieve repayment as aforesaid and are made subject to review and renegotiation at intervals of not more than five years.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated February 19, 1965, to the Secretary of the Army from the Director of the Budget, which indicates the basis for the law which was referred to by the Senator from Louisiana.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1965.

Hon. STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed herewith is a copy of our response to a request by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for views on H.R. 52, a bill "To provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiplepurpose water resource projects, and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority for recreation development of projects under his control." That response, including the recommended substitute bill drafted in cooperation with members of your Department, sets forth the administration's position on uniform policies regarding recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement at water resources projects.

Following the introduction of H.R. 9032, Federal agencies involved in the planning, development and construction of Federal water resources projects have applied the policies and procedures established therein.

Those agencies, as of this date, should implement the policies and procedures as contained in the substitute bill.

It is our understanding that a large number of project reports have been held by the Corps of Engineers pending development of the policies contained in the substitute bill. In view of the possibility of an omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control bill this year, we would expect that appropriate revisions will be made in the project reports as expeditiously as possible. If problems are encountered in such revisions, Bureau of the Budget staff will be available to discuss the matter with your staff.

The success of the administration's policies and procedures on this subject will require a high degree of cooperation and coordination among the Departments of the Interior and Army and the Bureau of the Budget, and a sincere effort by the water resources agencies to obtain cost sharing. In this connection, I believe you may wish to have brought to your attention as early as possible in the planning process any projects at which it is anticipated that non-Federal interests will not execute the required cost sharing agreement and where an allocation of project costs to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement is planned. Included in this category would be any project proposed for authorization pursuant to section 3 of the enclosed draft bill.

Sincerely,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Deputy Director.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand it—and I desire to clarify one point—the local contributions for flood control, navigation, and water supply have not been changed in any manner except——

Mr. McNAMARA. By the new law.

Mr. ELLENDER. By the new law.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The contributions to be made by the local people, let us say on flood control, have not been changed. The only thing affected by the new law would be the local cooperation with respect to recreation.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know that the Senator from Michigan has the floor, and I asked him to yield so that I could reply to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for that purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana has said. He and the Senator from Michigan are outstanding authorities in the Senate on these projects.

My reply is that although it is true the local people will have to pay for half the recreation benefits—which will be a help—the fact is that the benefits will still be intangible and it will be hard to assess the value of the remaining half.

Of course, the fees to be charged will help to some extent, but far more important is the fact that the discount figure for interest is unrealistic. After all, if a person could purchase a home on the basis of paying 2½-percent interest over a 100-year period, that would mean that he could buy a $20,000 home for less than $60 a month with no down payment. Who would not jump at that opportunity? But a banker would have to have an insane hatred of money to permit it.

The Federal Government is paying far more for its money than this 2½ percent. It must pay more than 4 percent, and close to 4¼ percent. And yet the rules of this game of self-deception and taxpayer deception pretends the taxpayer pays 2½ or 3 percent for the money this constitutes a hidden subsidy.

The rules of this game under which the Public Works Committee operates assumes that borrowers will accrue for a fictitious length of time.

A hundred years for the life of these projects is ridiculous. If they are dams, they silt in. Most projects are obsolete, utterly useless in far less than a hundred years. In some cases even 50 years is too much. It is true, as the senior Senator from Louisiana has said, that there is an additional opportunity to appraise these projects when they come before the Appropriations Subcommittee so ably headed by the Senator from Louisiana. However, the rules there are the same. The subsidized discount rate will be the same. The dishonest, 100 year benefit life will be the same. When those rules are followed, these uneconomical projects will be approved.

I conclude by saying that this is not only the position taken by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the position taken by Senator DOUGLAS during past years, but this is also the position taken by the overwhelming preponderance of competent economists in the field. Dr. Otto Eckstein, who is one of the top economic advisers to the President, wrote an excellent book on this subject. Dr. Robert Haveman, who is also highly regarded, has written on this subject. The expert consensus is that we are tragically wasting public money in this area.

I know the amendment may not be adopted. However, I have offered it, not out of any desire to embarrass or criticize the committee in connection with what it has done. It has been very expertly and competently handled by the Senator from Michigan. Rather, I do this in an attempt to dramatize the situation, in the hope that perhaps this year or next year, or at some time in the future, we can set up adequate, fair, and realistic standards with respect to interest and discount and benefit life, as well as with respect to evaluating the intangibles. And I intend to pursue this goal as long as I am in the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I do so also with the knowledge that any one of us who serves on the Public Works Committee, and is concerned with the Corps of Engineers projects, has questioned, at times, the formulas which are used for the approval of these projects.

It is correct to say that in recent years weight has been given to recreation and wildlife enhancement and other features, which, while of great value, are not as important as flood control and navigation and water conservation.

Nevertheless, I must join in what the Senator from Louisiana, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, has said. I served on it in an ex officio capacity by reason of the fact that I am the ranking minority member of the Public Works Committee, as does the Senator from Michigan, chairman of our committee.

I believe that all of us know that no Member of the Senate is able to secure from the Senator from Louisiana and from the Appropriations Committee approval of a project that does not meet the strictest criteria which have been prescribed. We honor him for his care, for he is the strongest advocate of river development in the Senate.

This leads us back to the original question raised by the Senator; namely, criteria. The proposal the Senator from Wisconsin has made about criteria is an arbitrary proposal.

I do not know anything more important in this bill than flood protection. In the valleys in Kentucky many of our flood control projects have great trouble meeting even the 1:1 ratio. Costs are high, due to the narrow valleys, and the encroachment on the river channels, because of the necessary location of industries in the narrow valleys increase the cost of projects year after year. It becomes more and more difficult to meet the cost-benefit ratio every year, even on a 1:1 basis. Yet the rains come down and wash these cities and towns away year after year. The formula the Senator from Wisconsin proposes could mean that needed flood protection could never be provided, and that those communities would continue to be washed away year after year.

The Senator has provoked a good question about criteria, and it is continually reviewed.

But I wish to emphasize the necessity of securing flood protection, and I believe the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would stand in the way. It should be defeated.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin. He has stimulated our thought. As I look at the fine projects in my own State, I remind him that although these House documents are new, the projects have been coming to me year after year. One of the projects, the Buffalo Bayou, is near Houston. One is near Texas City, and another is at Port Arthur and Beaumont. That is where so much damage was done by Hurricane Carla.

These are growing areas, where the flood damage increases each year. The cost ratio presupposes present values. However, it must be remembered that the values are going up fast.

We have worked for many years trying to have these projects approved.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan for the great care he has taken in connection with these projects. Some of my constituents have been disappointed, but no projects have been specially approved. It has taken many

years for the Army Engineers to get to this point. Delegations have come here year after year.

I refer particularly to Caddo Lake, where a dam is located. That particular project has been needed since before I came to the Senate, 8 years ago.

The lake itself is located in Louisiana. However, half of the lake backs up into my State.

I commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his long work on these projects, for giving his attention to each appropriation after it is authorized.

Caddo Lake was formed by a great earthquake in that valley, about 1811, the year that is called the Year of the Shakes in the Mississippi Valley. This earthquake is also thought to have been responsible for the formation of Reelfoot Lake. It was the gateway to Texas until the railroads were built, up the Mississippi and Red Rivers.

It is mainly due to the work of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana that this project is going ahead.

Another project involves a population of 300,000. Without flood protection, when the rains come, some areas are washed out. The work of guarding against such a catastrophe must go on year after year. First there is an authorization, then the survey, and then the construction moneys.

I commend the committee for the great diligence it has shown. I know from personal knowledge that there is nothing new here, that there is nothing in this authorization for my State that has not been thoroughly considered and studied. We have seen these projects year after year. Two of the areas were badly damaged by Hurricane Carla, some 4 years ago. Other projects have long been in existence. Caddo Lake has been in existence for many years. A very fine and thoughtful piece of work was done by the Public Works Committee. I commend them for their care and diligence. This program involves taxpayer money, and they are going very deliberately on these projects.

Also, although he is not on the committee, but is on the Appropriations Committee, I desire to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his great knowledge in this field, his care, and his support of these projects. I commend the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] also for their care in respect to these projects. We have had the benefit of their counsel and work as well as their leadership in the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCNAMARA. I thank the Senator. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who is a very able member of the committee, has asked me to yield to him. I shall yield to him first, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am grateful to the chairman of the committee for yielding to me. I, too, wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] for bringing to the Senate a bill providing for an investment in the resources of America and for the development of our water resources, our river resources, the saving of lives and the perpetuation of some of our cities and towns.

Because the Senator from Louisiana mentioned Public Law 872, I wish to make a comment about it.

I am a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That bill came out of the committee. Sometimes I think that bill will come back to haunt us. I emphasize the fact that recreation, fish and wildlife benefits of Federal dams, including Department of the Interior dams and Corps of Engineers dams, have been greater than we have anticipated, and, as recreational developments are needed in the years ahead, they will again be greater than we anticipated.

We should be very careful, as the report admonishes, not to prevent necessary flood control projects from developing because there is a failure of the local people to provide self-participation. If at the inception of the project there is a failure of local participation, later, as recreational developments come about, we shall find that the States or private organizations will wish to participate. People want to use these projects for water-based recreation, including swimming, boating, and so forth. So we should be careful to see that we do not prevent necessary flood control development merely because we cannot find initially the local participation that is required by Public Law 872. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, first I would join other Senators in congratulating the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] for his splendid accomplishments with the members of his committee in recognition of the vital importance of the control of water in our country today.

Many years ago, as chairman of the National Security Resources Board, now called OEP, a report was made by a committee chaired by William Paley, of New York. The basis of the report was what we would be shortest of in 25 years. That would be 10 years from now.

To my surprise, this report stated that, in all probability, the commodity of which we would be shortest would be fresh water.

I have had the privilege recently of reading many brochures and pamphlets that have to do with the achievements of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in the field of development of desalinization of salt water into fresh water. Those pamphlets will stand as a monument to his wisdom and foresight as expresed in that field.

Today the U.S. Government is spending a great many millions of dollars in order to get methods to obtain clean, fresh water from salt water.

We, in the Middle West, especially in Missouri, have a great deal of fresh water, but we have not taken advantage of controlling it as have so many other States. In 1951, for example, when in the executive branch, I had the dubious privilege of directing the rehabilitation resulting from those terrible floods that came to the Kansas City area. It was interesting to note that, whereas the total cost of flood control would have been about $220 million, people in the Kansas City area lost over $1 billion from that one flood.

I mention this to present with great respect to my able colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin, who has some criticism of proposed developments in northwest Missouri, and am glad to see my own colleague on the floor, because only in the last few days floods in this very part of Missouri—the Grand Platte, and the Fishing Rivers floods—have already caused over $50 million estimated damage, in addition to the loss of many lives as a result of the sudden flash floods, this proposed bill would correct.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. First, I should like to join my colleague in extending my compliments to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] for the great work that he has done on this particular piece of proposed legislation.

My colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], has mentioned the flooding conditions in Missouri. Last Friday and Saturday I drove, flew, and walked over that area of my State. Anyone who sees the suffering of the people in that area and sees the damage that has been done will realize that the proposal is not particularly a dollars-and-cents proposal. They will see that homes by the dozens in little towns have been completely floated off their foundations and crushed against large trees. A merchant to whom I was talking had a store in which $150,000 of furniture was damaged. The back end and the front end of the store had been washed out. He told me that he sold what he had left for $300. He did not owe a dime to start with. He said he did not have enough money to buy his wife a dinner that night.

Well-dressed men are seen digging in the debris and trying to recover some of their belongings. Furniture and boxes of clothes are piled in the streets and on the sidewalks.

On my desk now there is a memo from the State ASC committee telling us that 3 to 4 million dollars' worth of farm damage has been done in the area of Fishing River.

The President has allocated $500,000 to help repair the villages in that one little area of that particular river, Fishing River.

Over at Excelsior Springs, in the same area, great damage has been done to streets, sewers, waterlines, and homes. Many have been completely damaged. So actually the proposal would be a good investment from a dollars-and-cents standpoint, and curbing floods would save our people the great misery and suffering which they have endured.

My colleague has mentioned flooding on the Grand and Platte Rivers. I think that is particularly what our friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, has referred to. A number of years ago, when I was Acting Governor of Missouri, while our Governor was out of the State, we had a similar type of flood. I flew and drove through the area affected. I saw the million upon millions of dollars of damage that was done.

The project is one that has been worked on for a long time. It relates not only to the shortage of water and the conservation of water, which is so essential in that part of Missouri and that entire area, but to the industrialist, and from an agricultural standpoint, an investment in dams to control the flooding and to conserve the water certainly seems to me to be a good business investment for our Government and our people to make in considering the welfare of the people in that part of our State.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would join my colleague in the remarks he just made, remarks made after he personally just visited out there, and seeing this tragedy first hand, the loss in lives, the loss of millions upon millions of dollars worth of property.

Again I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his consideration in this bill. I know my colleague from Missouri would join me also in expressing our deep gratitude to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his understanding as to the importance of developing the water resources of the State of Missouri.

MISSOURI FLOOD DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, the announcement this morning that the President had designated 20 counties in northwest and west central Missouri as emergency disaster area and had allocated an initial grant of $500,000 to help repair and replace publicly owned facilities damaged or destroyed in last week's flood was good news.

But this emergency assistance, helpful as it is, can never replace the lives lost, nor can it compensate for the many millions of dollars in private property loss.

In an editorial last week, the Kansas City Star stated that the peculiar poignancy of the latest area floods is that they struck hardest in two basins, the Platte and Fishing, just north of Kansas City, where flood control plans are now awaiting final executive approval and congressional authorization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Kansas City Star be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOODS DRAMATIZE NEED FOR PENDING DAMS

The peculiar poignancy of the latest area floods is that they struck hardest on two streams where flood control plans now are being pushed avidly after years of inaction. The two Clay County communities of Smithville, on the Little Platte River, and Mosby, on the Fishing River, took the worst beating in this week's floods.

Several years ago the Army Engineers made preliminary flood need studies on the Platte, but funds ran out. Recently local backers revived the project and, with the help of their Congressman, Representative WILLIAM R. HULL, JR., obtained additional survey funds. The result was a $27 million program consisting of a $21 million reservoir just north of Smithville and channel improvements on both the Platte and Little Platte. Pushed vigorously by local interests, HULL and Missouri's two Senators, the plan has moved swiftly ahead through channels until now it is virtually ready to be inserted in a river projects authorization bill before Congress.

The Fishing River, a small but very "flashy" (i.e., fast rising) stream, long has harassed Excelsior Springs. At one time, several years ago, the engineers could not justify any project there on a benefit-to-cost ratio. But subsequent floods, indicating a higher probable frequency, and recognition of the dollar value of other benefits from impounded streams, have changed the picture. A plan for two small reservoirs just upstream from Excelsior is in the works, has been approved by Missouri and should clear the Army Engineers in time to make this year's biennial authorization bill.

But the tragic, obvious fact is that dams and levees not yet built cannot stem today's floods, however rapidly they now are being pushed toward construction. The Platte and Fishing River flood projects are at best, 3 or 4 years away. Planning and construction take time, however eager the supporters of the work may be to see them finished.

Not everywhere has help come too late. As the current pattern of soaking rains continues almost every night in July, area residents are reminded of 1951 and the catastrophic flood that finally moved down the Kaw and other rivers that year.

This summer such Kansas dams as Tuttle Creek, Pomona, and John Redmond—completed since 1951—have broken the back of developing major floods. But in northwest Missouri, moving fast but late into the flood protection field, the works on the drawing board are not in time to handle this summer's floods. It is a bitter dose for the families, farmers and businessmen who once more have had to flee in boats, leaving behind heavy losses. Their spirit, however, may have been best expressed by a Smithville merchant who was asked this week if the frequent sandbagging of his store front and cleaning up the muck and mess afterward didn't grow wearisome. "We can take it if we know help is on the way," he said.

With the flood plans now before Congress, help is on the way. Somewhat late, perhaps, but some year soon this scourge of flood will be laid to rest on the Platte and Fishing Rivers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, plans for the Platte and Fishing Rivers have not yet reached the Congress, but we hope that they will be coming from the Army in time so that they can be included in this year's omnibus authorization bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since I made a few remarks, I had the clerk of the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with public works obtain some data for me. I would like to call to the attention of my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin the fact that there have been 4,189 projects authorized prior to this bill.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to these figures. In the past, 4,189 projects have been authorized. Of that number, 3,005 have been completed; 552 of the 4,189 were deferred or are carried as inactive because the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committees on Appropriations, after examining into many of the projects, asked the corps to review their backlog of authorized projects and reclassify those projects where the benefit-cost ratio was not up to standard. Projects that did not meet those standards were then deferred. That has been going on for as long as public works have been constructed.

Of all the projects named in the bill, as many as 10 percent may not be built because, when the final studies are made and the engineering features refined, it may be found that the benefit-cost ratio is no longer favorable.

As I have said, of 4,189 projects authorized, only 3,637 have been completed or are now in the process of being constructed; 552 projects having an estimated cost of $2.5 billion have been inactivated because the benefit-cost ratio was not what it should have been or the requirements of local cooperation have not been met.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not question that the distinguished Senator from Lousiana is a discriminating, fair, competent chairman of his subcommittee, just as the Senator from Michigan is of his committee. I am sure they apply the rules fairly and refuse to approve projects which do not have a favorable benefit-cost ratio.

I am speaking about the rule that determines what is a fair benefit-cost ratio. I still maintain that my position has not been challenged, namely, that the rule is not realistic; it does not tell the taxpayer or Congress what the benefits really are and what the costs really are.

The Senator from Louisiana has been extremely fair and competent within the rules; but I question the rules.

I am sympathetic toward the views of the distinguished Senators from Missouri concerning the conditions that confront their State. Wisconsin, too, earlier this year suffered terrible flood and tornado damage and loss of life. I deplore the loss of human life. How can one evaluate the loss of life? He cannot. The value of a life that is lost is infinite.

I heartily approve of flood control projects; but if we are to operate in an economic, sensible way, we ought to apply sensible, economic criteria, and stick to them, so that we will know what we are going to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the quorum call is rescinded.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order for the quorum call has already been rescinded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, the Army Corps of Engineers telephoned by office with respect to the Tahquitz project, included by the courtesy of the Committee on Public Works. I am the author of the Tahquitz legislation, which passed Congress several years ago. It is located in an arid part of the county of Riverside in my State. There will be a local contribution geared to the percentage of real property in the area over which the Tahquitz project would operate.

The Corps of Engineers finds that the property is not so large as it once was; therefore, it will be required to contribute the charge to the local area when the Tahquitz project is under consideration.

It is the Corps of Engineers that recommends this language, not the Senator from California. The language I propose to offer as an amendment reads:

At the appropriate place in the bill—

Which is on page 30—

at the conclusion of line 11, insert the following language: "*Provided*, That the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000."

I repeat to Senators, and particularly to the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. McNAMARA], that this project is recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers. On that basis, I ask the chairman to consider accepting the amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the request comes very late.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is true.

Mr. McNAMARA. This amendment was not presented at the hearings before the committee.

I do not for a moment question the statement that the Corps of Engineers has approved it. But we have had clearance from the Bureau of the Budget on every project in the bill before us, and to accept the proposal of the Senator from California would be out of character considering the criteria that we have been using today.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not believe it would be. I merely ask that the chairman consider taking the amendment. I apologize for bringing this up at this late moment.

Mr. McNAMARA. The House has not acted on a bill. The House has started hearings on these projects. I would think that the amendment could be offered during House consideration of this measure and by the time the bill is put before the House, it could be amended.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not know how a representative of any area in the country would legislate if the the circumstances and the exigencies surrounding the situation were to result in a last moment recommendation by the agency charged with the responsibility of making this construction.

I am doing what the Senator would do if he were in my situation.

Mr. McNAMARA. The responsible downtown agency in the Corps of Engineers would make the recommendation. I would try to have the amendment agreed to in the House, if I were in the position of the Senator.

It would be a month before the measure would get through the House. It is almost certain of passage in the House.

I should think that the Army Engineers would have taken the matter up with our committee with the House.

The provision can easily and properly be included in the bill there.

We have had no opportunity to study this amendment or to hear any testimony on it. We would like to have an opportunity to hear testimony concerning the proposal in the committee before arguing to it. I believe the Senator understands how we feel.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the calling of the quorum I had a further discussion with the Senator from Michigan.

I came to the Chamber a few moments ago, after my staff had received this recommendation from the Army Corps of Engineers, based on its own up-to-the-moment survey of the data surrounding the Tahquitz project.

The distinguished and able Senator from Michigan has made the point that since no hearings were held by a Senate committee, he would hope that the amendment might be considered before the House committee.

I believe that, in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, I have tried to discharge my responsibility as a Senator to my State and, in particular, to this area of my State. This project was authorized because of legislation which I introduced several years ago.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am most sympathetic toward the position of the Senator. I know of his great interest in the project. I know of his activities in past years in connection with this matter. However, we are advised that the House is to start hearings on the bill immediately.

There will be every opportunity for the Senator to have his amendment considered and included in the bill.

There will be no problem. I ask the Senator to give us an opportunity to permit the departments and agencies to make recommendations.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the comment of the Senator.

I read my amendment. I did not offer it. Rather than raise a needless controversy, particularly in view of the comments which the able Senator from Michigan has made, I do not intend to offer the amendment.

I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield so that we may have a third reading of the bill before discussing another matter?

NAVIGATION ON THE MISSOURI BETWEEN YANKTON AND SIOUX CITY AND OTHER SOUTH DAKOTA PROJECTS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment to the Omnibus Public Works Act of 1965. The amendment would, in addition to the projects already included in the bill by the committee, authorize the construction of a Corps of Engineers navigation and bank stabilization program on the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to Yankton, S. Dak. After discussing the amendment with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, Senator McNAMARA, I will not offer the amendment now. He tells me that the committee cannot accept the proposal until the Corps of Engineers Board of Review and other Government agencies complete their review.

By way of explanation, let me say that under the original Missouri Basin plan, the corps had envisioned navigation on the Missouri from the point where it enters the Mississippi near St. Louis as far north as Yankton, S. Dak. Just north of Yankton the first of the Missouri great mainstem dams, the Gavins Point Dam, is located. Beyond this dam lies the Gavins Point Reservoir and beyond it, lies the other great reservoirs in South Dakota and North Dakota.

To date, authorized navigation and bank stabilization projects reach as far north as Sioux City, Iowa. The Missouri is largely operative for navigation as far north as Omaha and the river reach between Omaha and Sioux City is presently under construction and is partially operative.

The corps has completed its studies and investigations on this project and has found it to be feasible. The project has been reported favorably to the Chief of Engineers here in Washington, bearing a benefit-cost ratio of 1.06 to 1, with an estimated potential cost of $57,782,000 of which $333,000 is non-Federal.

The river distance between Sioux City and Yankton is 77 miles and the project is twofold, involving the stabilization of the riverbank and the construction of a

300-foot channel, 9 feet deep. It essentially would be based on proven works of the type constructed below Sioux City. Presently, a bank stabilization project ends at Kenslers Bend above Sioux City and for 64 miles the river width varies from 1,200 to 5,000 feet, averaging 2,600 feet. Each year many acres of rich South Dakota farmland is contributed to the river through bank erosion. This project would stabilize the bank by dikes and revetments and would contract the river to 600 feet. The corps has found the production capability of agricultural lands in the meander belt to be substantially in excess of current production levels. The project would not only release many valuable acres for agriculture, but it would remove flood and meander threats, thus stabilizing existing land values and allow realistic bank and insurance company financing all along this stretch of the river.

The corps conservatively estimates that if the project proceeds on schedule, by 1975 over 68,000 tons of farm commodities would probably move in and out of the port of Yankton and a further projection for 50 years indicates a probable movement of 1.5 million tons annually. Adequate plans for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses have been included by the corps and it is my understanding from corps officials that minor revisions can be adequately dealt with in cooperation with appropriate State and Federal agencies.

Mr. President, over the years the Upper Great Plains has contributed its land for reservoir uses and flood control protection. The commercial development of the river has now been authorized and constructed as far north as Sioux City, Iowa. South Dakota needs and deserves fair and equal treatment—it needs every stimulus to expand its economic resources. At the present time we depend on a one-industry economy for survival—agriculture. In large terms we neither process our agricultural products nor do we distribute them. This project can encourage industrial growth in South Dakota. By making inexpensive water transportation available, we can not only export raw agricultural products but encourage processors of these products to locate in South Dakota and have direct transportation outlets available all along the Missouri-Mississippi complex as far south as New Orleans.

Mr. President, South Dakota wants and needs this project authorized now. Already the ports to the south are planning and locating their industrial complexes near and around the river ports. Sioux City and Omaha Chambers of Commerce are laboring night and day to attract grain processors to their communities. Yankton and the adjacent areas in South Dakota and Nebraska should have this same opportunity. We know that the corps wants to complete its plan for navigation and stabilization to its northernmost point. To wait another 2, 3, or 4 years for another omnibus bill could prove to disadvantage South Dakota interests seriously. Industry needs to know what the Government intends to do in the field of public works to implement its long-term expansion programs and South Dakota needs this project authorized by the Congress in order to fulfill the hopes and dreams of its people. During the period 1950–60, when average personal income increased on a national scale by 120 percent, South Dakota's average was only 60 percent. We desperately need public works projects such as the one which forms the subject of this amendment if we are to move forward with the rest of the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] could accept my amendment, but I realize that the committee is awaiting proper reports from the Federal agencies. I am pleased that the Senator from Michigan has assured me that he will work with me in securing prompt handling of the legislation when the reports, which have not arrived as early as I had anticipated, are available.

Mr. President, in addition to my remarks regarding the Missouri River navigation project, allow me to express my deep gratitude for two programs included in the bill which affect South Dakota.

The Big Sioux River flood control project, which is a part of the bill as reported, is urgently needed in my State. The amendment which the Senate accepted to this project, I am sure, can be worked out to the satisfaction of the corps and the sovereign States of Iowa and South Dakota.

Let me also applaud the Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River project in South Dakota and Minnesota. Big Stone Lake is a major recreation spot in South Dakota and is in dire need of assistance to maintain the lake level and improve the wildlife habitat for fish and wildfowl. I am confident that authorization of the project will receive the enthusiastic approval of conservation interests throughout the area.

Mr. President, I shall not call up my amendment in view of the discussion I have had with the chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. However, I should like to have assurance that the Senator will do what he can and work with me when the reports are in so that we can move the project along.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion on the amendment concerning which the Senator has spoken. We are sympathetic toward the position of the Senator. We believe that his project is a good project. However, the project has not had the approval of the agencies and the Bureau of the Budget, as have the other projects contained in the bill.

The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota presents a situation similar to that which we have just discussed with the distinguished Senator from California.

I would hope on the basis of our colloquy we have established that, after appropriate consideration, this project will be brought before the Senate.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in view of the assurances that the Senator from Michigan has given me, I shall not call up my amendment. However, I shall call on the Senator for help to expedite the project when the reports are completed.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to cooperate with the Senator. I appreciate his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, before final action is taken on the bill, I express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the committee and to the members of the committee for the work which they have done on this bill and on previous bills.

I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who has been so helpful in dealing with projects in our State and in the Nation.

We have just experienced a very disastrous flood in certain streams in Kansas. The heavy flooding which has occurred in some parts of Kansas in June and to a lesser degree in July as rains continued here and there, can be likened to a depositor's statement we periodically receive from our banks. In other words, nature has furnished us an accounting of where we stand in Kansas in the matter of flood control and protection. Perhaps next year, possibly within the summer at hand, an extreme drought condition will furnish us a checkup on what headway we are making in the direction of water reserve to meet such conditions.

Last June was the wettest since the disastrous floods of 1951. Quite naturally many of our citizens commented on the similarity of conditions between this year and 1951. There was a similarity in the timing of the rainfall although not the intensity and volume of flood impact. But there was a great dissimilarity that has nothing to do with the weather, and that is in the reservoirs and other structures which have been built by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture watershed program.

At the time of the 1951 flood, only Kanopolis and Fall River and a few other structures were in place. As of this time, 14 multiple-purpose reservoirs with substantial flood control allocations are in place and these are supplemented by local protection at certain critical areas and by watershed projects. It would seem apparent that the structures built since 1951 would make the likelihood of another 1951 flood much less likely, and that is true. While the dams have proved their worth within the limits of their respective areas of influence, there is, however, on the red side of the ledger a total of some millions of dollars of damage in areas where reservoir and other works needs to be accomplished.

Heaviest damage within the State, as most of us know, was recorded along the Arkansas River in the jurisdiction of the

Albuquerque district of the corps extending eastward to Great Bend. Although the John Martin Reservoir on the Arkansas 60 miles into Colorado effectively reduced flood crests for some distance downriver, there was nothing in place in the way of reservoirs in the Arkansas Valley in Kansas to team up with John Martin, and with local protection and flood fighting at various communities along the way. Local protection works at Hutchinson and Wichita, in the Tulsa district of the corps, however, stood the test of floodwaters. A House subcommittee group recently completed a study of the flooded area along the Arkansas, and particularly at Augusta and along Walnut Creek, and has urged more funds for a corps study. The Tulsa district engineer has reported that damage east of Great Bend would have been held to considerably less had projects now proposed been in place.

There was flooding elsewhere in Kansas, but the big news may have been the floods that did not happen. At the finished reservoirs, Tuttle Creek, Pomona, Kanopolis, Fall River, John Redmond, Council Grove, and some Bureau reservoirs, lake levels jumped up as the high waters poured into the manmade traps. Tuttle Creek, for example, once again proved its effectiveness in keeping Big Blue floodwaters out of the Kaw. John Redmond, which was the scene of a dedication program at the time the floodwater impoundment was at its peak, is credited with preventing more than a million dollars in possible damages at Burlington and elsewhere downstream.

Although the dams, and the local protection works at Manhattan, Topeka, and Salina, proved their worth, there was, however, the matter of an estimated $6.5 million of flood damage mainly in areas where reservoir work needs to be accomplished. While Kansas is being benefited by the reservoirs now in place, and others about to come into the picture such as Milford and Wilson in the corps complex, and the Bureau's Glen Elder, it is apparent there is urgent work yet to be done.

Some of the worst floods this year have resulted from spotty downpours, local in extent and outside the range of the reservoirs. These areas pointed up particularly the need for local protection, either supplemental to reservoir control or working on its own.

At Ottawa on the Marais des Cygnes we had dramatic evidence of what flood protection really means. This was an example of the coordinated efforts of local works and a reservoir, in this case, Pomona. Without this protection, Ottawa, which suffered so severely in 1951 and other floods, would be in the cleanup stages from at least two overflows.

In fiscal year 1965, the Federal Government is spending about $63 million on water resources development in Kansas, some $55 million more than a decade ago in 1955. The total Federal investment in Kansas water now totals more than $470 million. Fiscal year 1966, as based on the President's budget and congressional action to date, is expected to reflect similar continued acceleration of water resources development in the State. The bulk of the funds expected for fiscal year 1966 will go into actual construction, although a substantial amount will be for initiation or continuation of studies. Some of this money will be spent in areas which have shown up as trouble spots in the recent flooding. As population and development continues, more works now in the proposed or visionary stages, will be added to take care of the added demands of flood control, water supply, and recreation. Some say that by 1975 Kansas and its visitors can use upward of 23 completed Federal reservoirs for recreation.

While flood control is a primary consideration in the advent and strengthening of the Federal reservoir system in the various basins in Kansas, the size of these reservoirs and the conservation lakes they provide adds a new element to recreation in the State. Kanopolis, the first of the Federal reservoirs completed by the corps in 1948, included a lake of 3,500 acres, nearly 10 times as big as the previous largest nearby body of water. Today, the 14 completed reservoirs offer over 80,000 acres of lake area which are being used by several million visitors annually. The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation provide certain facilities and cooperate with the Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission and the Kansas Park and Resources Authority in maintenance and development. The authority has undertaken intensive development as State park areas at some of the reservoirs.

In addition it is estimated there are about 70,000 farm ponds on private farm lands in Kansas. These provide about 90,000 acres of water surface which in many instances are used for recreation. Also, lakes in place or planned in organized watershed districts will add upward of 10,000 more acres of water. One of the outstanding watershed developments is the White Clay, Brewery Creek Watershed District which rings Atchison with 25 small lakes. The watershed improvement was developed as a product of joint study and cooperation with the Corps which has the responsibility for local flood protection works at Atchison.

Those who have visited the big reservoirs in Kansas or perhaps live nearby or have business interests in the area must agree that the recreation and tourist trade in the State has become a tremendous industry. At the same time, some of the reservoirs will provide for future water supply as it may be needed by the State for municipal and industrial uses. While we are fortunate in having these reservoirs for impoundment of flood waters at this time, we are doubly blessed in being able to capture some of the water for the dry periods which inevitably come around in nature's cycle of events.

We have a splendid water resources program well underway in Kansas. We realize too that the future growth and development of this area of the country is going to be determined by the amount of water we can control, and subsequently put to beneficial use. I am privileged to be part of the team which has put a sound and progressive water development program on the road. The State itself has been fortunate in having had good leadership able to see the long-range picture. The Kansas Governors, the legislature, the water resources board and the congressional delegations, have, in cooperation with local governments and representatives of such groups as Mo-Ark and local chambers of commerce, directed efforts toward molding of a comprehensive plan for the State. This procedure has provided excellent working relationship with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture, and all State and Federal agencies concerned.

While we are passing out credits for those instrumental in advancing our water resources program, we must not overlook a prime contributor to this effort, and that is the farm owner, or perhaps the small home owner, who relocates in order to make room for reservoirs and other improvements. While he is paid for this dislocation, and in many cases finds himself better off as to finances and living conditions if he is able to locate in the general area of a reservoir, he is, in my book, an unsung hero in this age of advancement.

Mr. President, there is ample proof that we can save many millions of dollars as a result of the reservoirs that have been constructed. I am very hopeful that further projects of this kind can be constructed and carried out in order that we may further protect the damaged communities and our rural areas.

I appreciate very much the progress that we have made and look forward to further progress.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a recommendation made by the committee with respect to the cost sharing guidelines presented in S. 1229 with reference to multiple-purpose projects.

This question was alluded to a few minutes ago during the debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator from Louisiana commented on the guidelines, as did the Senator from Michigan. I would like to comment on this subject for the purposes of interpretation, particularly with respect to future action of the agencies of the Federal Government when questions of authorizations and appropriations of Corps of Engineers projects may arise.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who expressed great interest in this matter in the committee and helped write the committee recommendations. I would like to read into the RECORD from page 14 of the report; its recommendations:

Application of cost-sharing guidelines to non-Federal public bodies in connection with flood control projects: The committee notes its strong desire that the guidelines proposed for Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects in S. 1229 be applied by departments and agencies of the executive branch with flexibility in regard to flood protection programs developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In particular, the committee calls attention to the burden that would be imposed on many non-Federal public bodies by requiring them to share the sep-

arable costs attributable to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. The inability of such non-Federal public bodies to share in these costs would result in the denial of needed flood control facilities required to protect lives and property and communities.

In this regard, the committee also notes the intent of the Senate, as developed in the debate at the time of adoption of the conference report on S. 1229 on June 25, 1965, that flood projection projects under the Corps of Engineers, and involving recommendations about agreements with non-Federal public bodies, be submitted by the executive agencies and the Bureau of the Budget to this committee for decisions on authorization and for recommendation to the Senate. This intent most certainly represents the feelings of the members of this committee.

Further, the committee recognizes the benefits which come from recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, and it encourages such development. It does feel, however, that it would be wrong to deny flood protection facilities to communities and river basins because of guidelines established and administered by the executive agencies of the Federal Government. The consideration and authorization of these facilities is the responsibility of the Congress, and the committee does not want these guidelines used to make impossible the congressional consideration of projects and the appropriation of funds for such projects. Inability of non-Federal public bodies to share in the allocation of costs made in plans developed by executive agencies should not result in the denial of flood protection afforded by projects which affect the areas involved.

Mr. President, for the purpose of providing the background for this recommendation, I call attention to the fact that S. 1229, a bill requested by the President and reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has been approved by the Congress. This bill would apply to multiple-purpose projects, those developed by the Corps of Engineers as well as the Bureau of Reclamation. The bill called for one-half of the separable costs attributable to recreation benefits and fish and wildlife enhancement to be borne by what are called non-Federal public bodies.

In a colloquy between the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and myself, on June 25, 1965, we attempted to outline his interpretation of the guidelines.

It was his interpretation that "non-Federal public bodies" did not mean solely the community or communities nearest the project which might enjoy recreational benefits and fish and wildlife enhancement benefits. The Senator stated that the term "non-Federal public bodies" could include the State itself, and such other public bodies as might be organized by the State as well as near local communities. He said, further, that there would be a period—as I remember, about 10 years—after the authorization of a project during which the details of an arrangement for payment of one-half of the separable costs could be worked out by the Federal Government and the appropriate non-Federal public body, which might be the State itself.

It was his further understanding, that in the event that one-half of the separable cost was imposed upon a non-Federal public body, the cost could be amortized over a period of 50 years, as could the project itself, and if the non-Federal public body desired, it could recover its portion of the separable costs—one-half—by the imposition of fees.

In the colloquy I called attention to the fact that the strict imposition of these guide lines might deny the provision and construction of necessary flood control projects. The Senator from Washington said that he did not believe that it was intended to be so inflexibly applied that it would deny the construction of needed flood protection facilities.

In our Public Works Committee, in discussing this problem, it was the agreement of the committee that the Federal agencies would be expected to apply the guidelines with reasonable flexibility so as not to deny communities the opportunity to go ahead with construction of necessary flood protection. We agreed that flood protection is imperative.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] made a very strong statement on the subject, and the recommendation arrived at between the Senator from Montana and myself was approved by the committee.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. I wanted it to appear in the RECORD so that the interpretation and intention of the Senate Committee on Public Works would be understood by the executive department, by the Corps of Engineers, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by other agencies which must give their approval to the authorization and appropriations of Corps of Engineers projects.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. There are a number of members of the Senate committee and members of the Senate staff who would agree with the language of the bill before the Senate. S. 1229 was clearly a bill dealing with recreation and fish and wildlife. It did not deal with flood control. Therefore, I do not quite understand how it could deal with flood control projects.

Mr. COOPER. Let us assume the chief purpose of a project is flood protection. Let us consider a dam necessary to be constructed above a city or small community to give flood protection to the city and downstream communities. The Corps of Engineers might find, considering only flood protection, that the cost-benefit ratio was 1 to 0.9; and therefore it could not recommend the facility for authorization.

But by giving some benefit for recreation and the fish and wildlife enhancement, it might reach 1 to 1.2, and it could be approved for flood protection. The point I make is that if the guideline of S. 1229 is inflexibly applied, in demand for payment of one-half of costs, they could not include the needed recreational benefits and fish and wildlife enhancement necessary to secure a favorable cost-benefit ratio. Thus the construction of needed flood protection could be denied.

Mr. ANDERSON. That was considered. The members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs felt that if a project could not stand on its own feet, we should not pad it with fish and wildlife, in order to make it look good.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that.

Mr. ANDERSON. That was the whole purpose of it.

Mr. COOPER. That has been the position of the agency, but we will let the interpretation, as we see it, speak for itself. The Public Works Committee does not want to see consideration or construction of greatly needed flood protection facilities under the Corps of Engineers slowed or stopped or denied, and that is our purpose.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to praise the diligence of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works [Mr. MCNAMARA] in shaping and molding the omnibus rivers and harbors bill of 1965.

The authorization for rivers and harbors and flood control projects, which I am confident the Senate will approve, represents an investment—an investment, Mr. President, in human life and property.

Every project authorized in this bill will bring returns which will significantly exceed the funds that will be invested by the Federal Government and by the several States.

As for Indiana, Mr. President, this is the greatest authorization in history. Some years ago, some short-sighted leaders in my State tried to convince the people that they should not accept Federal assistance for these projects. Needless to say, the State was not able to shoulder alone the terrible financial burden of constructing flood control facilities and reservoirs. As a result, Hoosiers fell behind the Nation in its efforts at conservation and failed to protect itself against the ravages of floods.

Today, Mr. President, I am pleased to say that this has all changed. We in Indiana today understand the need for conservation, for flood control projects, for reservoirs, for the recreational benefits that accrue to us from these projects.

Through coordinated and cooperative efforts on the part of our State government, private conservation groups in Indiana, and our delegation in Congress, Indiana today can say that of all 50 States, we rank sixth in the dollars authorized for flood control and rivers and harbors in this 1965 bill.

We can say today that of the more than $98 million in Federal funds authorized for Indiana in this bill, we have four major dam and reservoir projects and a major deepwater port project.

As you know, Mr. President, these things just do not happen by themselves. They result from hard and diligent study and unceasing work on the part of the Senate Public Works Committee and the many people in this Nation who care enough about our natural resources to attempt to preserve them today for the generations of tomorrow.

Again, Mr. President, I would like to thank my distinguished chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] for his untiring efforts in this field. I am proud to be a member of his committee and to have been able to contribute in my own limited way to this

great and comprehensive contribution to the future of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2300) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2300

An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

Navigation

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor; and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered 226, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,112,000;

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000: *Provided,* That in order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimate cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $563,000;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered—, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000: *Provided,* That any funds appropriated for the construction of this project shall not be utilized until such time as the Indiana dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by Act of Congress.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington: Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $676,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

Beach erosion

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,400;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

SEC. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, or in other sections of this Act, subsequent to the initiation of the studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of October 23, 1962 (Public Law 874, Eighty-seventh Congress), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act: *Provided further,* That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects herein adopted: *And provided further,* That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor, and shall not take precedence over other projects of higher priority for improvements.

SEC. 103. That section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300) as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. (a) That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian water milfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies: *Provided,* That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations: *Provided further,* That costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the au-

thorities of this section may be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: *Provided,* That any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

SEC. 104. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

SEC. 106. Title I of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided,* That the authorization for any flood control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided,* That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further,* That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further,* That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

Saint John River Basin

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

Housatonic River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Still River at Danbury, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,300,000.

The project for flood protection on the Housatonic and Naugatuck Rivers at Derby, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,800,000.

New England-Atlantic Coastal Area

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

Long Island Sound Area

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eight Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

New York-Atlantic Coastal Area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

Elizabeth River Basin, New Jersey

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

Rahway River Basin, New Jersey

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

Neuse River Basin

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

Middle Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

Flint River Basin

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

Central and southern Florida basin

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items: *Provided,* That said projects shall be prosecuted within the monetary authorization made available for the comprehensive plan.

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

South Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-

ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

Phillippi Creek Basin, Florida

The project for flood control in Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

Lower Mississippi River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at a cost not to exceed $181,109,100, and the authorization for the lower Mississippi River project is hereby increased accordingly: *Provided,* That this authorization shall not be made available for the prosecution of any projects except those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress: *Provided further,* That any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928: *And provided further,* That the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $56,922,000.

Ouachita River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

Red River Basin

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and Tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

Gulf of Mexico

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,290,000.

Rio Grande Basin

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

Arkansas River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineeds in Senate Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

Missouri River Basin

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hayes, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantiall as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000: *Provided,* That such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $278,635,000.

Ohio River Basin

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Devils Jumps Reservoir, Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $151,000,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided,* That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further,* That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further,* That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications,

Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River, and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000: *Provided*, That prior to initiation of construction the Department of the Army will prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

Upper Mississippi River Basin

The project for flood protection at East St. Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000: *Provided*, That local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for flood protection on the Iowa River at Marshalltown, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,670,000.

The project for flood protection on the Cedar River at Waterloo, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,900,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

Great Lake Basin

The project for flood protection on the Maumee River at and in the vicinity of Findlay, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 158, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,317,000.

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

Little Colorado River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

Gila River Basin

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

Eel River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

Sacramento River Basin

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

San Francisco Bay Area

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

Whitewater River Basin

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,030,000.

San Diego River Basin

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000.

Columbia River Basin

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

SEC. 204. (a) In the prosecution of improvements of rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such improvements are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or any subsequent similar Act requiring the designation of an area by the Secretary of Commerce as a condition of such assistance, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects within such areas.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction: *Provided*, That in the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and: *Provided further*, That the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie: *Provided*, That such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including chanel and major drainage improvements,

and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande River and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drains directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coast lines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

SEC. 208. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR FOR NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT STUDIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a considerable amount of concern has been expressed as to the implications for water resource development inherent in the November 20, 1964, directive of the Chief of Engineers regarding criteria to be employed in evaluating new improvements.

Several river valley associations have joined together in expressing views on this subject to the Chief of Engineers. He has responded in detail.

A representative of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Mr. William J. Hull, also represented the Arkansas Basin Development Association, the Inland Empire Waterways Association, Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., the Mississippi Valley Association, and the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Authority, in testifying June 10, 1965, before an ad hoc group of the Public Works Committee over which I presided.

In essence, the joint position of the organizations was one of commending the intent of the Chief of Engineers in seeking sound and conservative standards of project evaluation. But the belief was expressed that generally the Corps of Engineers' traffic estimates in project evaluation under previous standards have been fully justified by experience and that there is basis for concern first, lest the newly promulgated standards for traffic estimates result in serious understatement of project potentials; and second, lest these standards introduce an element of subjective conjecture into project evaluation which would obstruct meaningful review of Corps of Engineers reports by the cognizant committees of Congress.

Mr. President, I feel that there is considerable support for the request further stated by the several associations and authorities represented that the Chief of Engineers review the criteria for traffic estimates under the instructions of November 20, 1964, in the light of the conditions cited above and in the light of the emphasis on economic growth and development called for by the "Report on Policies, Standards, and Procedures for Formulating and Evaluating Water Resource Projects," approved by the President in May 1962 and published as Senate Document 97, 87th Congress, 2d session.

COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE AND SUBVERSION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the best and most informative weekly radio broadcasts in this country is the "Manion Forum," which is produced by Dean Clarence Manion, of South Bend, Ind. Dean Manion was formerly dean of the Law School at Notre Dame University.

In the "Manion Forum" broadcast of April 25, 1965, Miss Marilyn Manion, Dean Manion's very able and dedicated daughter, interviewed Mr. J. G. Sourwine, the distinguished chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The interview was on the subject of Communist espionage and subversion.

Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with this interview and feel that it should be studied by every Member of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this radio broadcast printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following the text of this broadcast, an important excerpt from Whittaker Chambers' monumental literary work, "Witness." This excerpt was printed with the "Manion Forum" broadcast, and I feel that this excerpt entitled "Why Does Communism Continue To Exist—Even in America?" should likewise be studied by all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the interview and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE AND SUBVERSION—EXPERT TESTIMONY REVEALS ITS BREADTH AND DEPTH IN THE U.S.A.

(Interview with J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee)

DEAN MANION. For many years the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate has had a subcommittee for the investigation of the administration of the internal security of the United States—communism, among other things. This subcommittee is composed of nine U.S. Senators, and for many years, as its chief counsel, it has had Mr. J. G. Sourwine. Throughout the years of his service, Mr. Sourwine has acquired a great fund of experience about subversion and subversive activities in the United States.

I take you now to Washington, D.C., where my daughter, Marilyn, is interviewing Mr. J. G. Sourwine, counsel of the Senate subcommittee to investigate the administration of internal security in this country.

MARILYN MANION. Mr. Sourwine, to begin our discussion, I'd like to ask you a very basic question. Since we shall be discussing the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, what is the purpose of the subcommittee? Why does it exist?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Internal Security Subcommittee was created because at the time of passage of the Internal Security Act, Senator McCarran, who was the father of that act, and other Senators thought there should be in the Senate a committee charged with the dual responsibility of legislative oversight of that act and other internal security laws, and charged also with investigating the activities of the Communist Party and other subversive organizations of a totalitarian nature in the United States.

The committee was authorized initially by a resolution of the Senate passed at the end of 1950, and activated in early 1951. The committee has a very specific charter which gives it several responsibilities: those I have mentioned, and the further responsibility of a continuing investigation with respect to propaganda by the Communist Party or any other subservise organization which threatens the internal security of the country. To use the words of our basic resolution, "including but not limited to espionage and subversion."

MARILYN MANION. Is there really a subversive threat to America today; and specifically, is there a strong Communist threat? And is there Communist espionage going on in the United States at the present time?

Mr. SOURWINE. Those are three questions. They are interlocked. The answers are "Yes" in every instance. There is a threat to the internal security of the country just as there is a threat to the internal security of every free country in the world as long as the world Communist conspiracy exists and has as its objective the communization of the world.

The Communist Party is a definite danger to the security because the Communist Party USA is an arm of the world Communist conspiracy, responsible to Moscow, whose tactics and strategy in many instances are directly dictated by Moscow. And because this is a

group of hard-core Communists, which means dedicated, disciplined and able.

Now with respect to espionage, we must accept as a fact that there is espionage in the United States, unless we wish to take the position that the Communists are treating the United States, their main enemy, differently from the way they are treating every other country on earth. We have additional evidence with respect to espionage in testimony which has been given back through the years by persons who had been members of the party—parties to the conspiracy, and who have told us what the Communist plan and program is and how they operate.

For instance, several espionage networks have been disclosed. The network which was headed at various times by John Abt and Harold Ware and Nat Witt was one which was exposed. We know that there was another at that time which was not exposed then and has not been exposed since, because we have the sworn testimony that an effort was made to recruit Alger Hiss into the Abt-Ware-Witt group of the party but that the word came through from topside to leave him alone, that he was working with another group.

Now we know that the Communists usually set up their networks in a dual manner. That is, two networks side by side, independent of each other but with the same objectives. When you disclose one and don't find its opposite number, you know that there is one that is still to be uncovered. Also, the Soviet Union has espionage networks operating under three different branches of its government—military, naval and secret police. We have uncovered in this country more than one secret police network. We have uncovered at least one Soviet military espionage network, the Abel network. We have never uncovered a Soviet naval espionage network.

Even in the case of our top level intelligence agencies, there is always a danger of infiltration. The head of the CIA told us some years ago that while he did not know of Communist infiltration in his agency—of course, if he did know about it, he would eliminate it—he operated on the assumption that the agency had been infiltrated. And a more recent instance was that of a defector from a high level position in a Communist country who had himself headed espionage activity who told us that he knew that every agency of our Government had been infiltrated with the exception of the FBI. He didn't know that it had not been infiltrated, but he didn't know that it had been. Is that a sufficient answer?

INFILTRATION BY FEW INFLUENCES MANY

MARILYN MANION. Yes, it is, Mr. Sourwine. You have told us how active the Communists are in the areas of infiltration and espionage. What specifically have they accomplished by this? What goals have they reached?

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, the Communist Party's goals in this country have been many. Many of their goals involve conditioning the people of the country to accept some Communist theory or to act in some way that the Communists want them to act. Perhaps the best way to answer your question would be to give you a single illustration of one Communist operation which has been fully documented by our committee. Would that do?

MARILYN MANION. That certainly would.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, then, take the case of the Institute of Pacific Relations. This was a non-Communist organization formed in Hawaii, infiltrated and taken over by the Communists while it was still small. They gained control in the 1920's. They built the organization. And they made it eventually the top authoritative organization for scholars and historians in the area of Far Eastern affairs. They published the most authoritative magazine in this area, which was edited by Owen Lattimore, a magazine called Pacific Affairs.

And as a result of this control over a period of 20 years and more, they succeeded in conditioning the thinking of the American people, not only the mass of the people, but the scholars in the field, until nearly everyone in this country was ready and willing to accept a number of false theories about the Far East, incuding the theory (which thank goodness has now been exploded) that the Chinese Communist movement was just a bunch of agrarian reformers. They did this—the Communists did this—with at no time more than 500 persons involved, of whom at no time were more than 200 party members.

MARILYN MANION. I see that the subcommittee has recently issued a report which describes extensive Communist activities in Latin America, including Communist infiltration among students there. But what about Communist influences on students right here in the United States?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Communists are actively working in that area. A new drive on youth was begun a little over 3 years ago, and between 2 and 3 years ago there was increased emphasis by the party on the campuses as targets.

MARILYN MANION. We hear a lot about academic freedom whenever the American student community is being discussed. And the usual question is: Why shouldn't a Communist be allowed to teach in a school?

Mr. SOURWINE. The reason for this is best explained, I think, by a simile. When a man builds a granary, he builds into the granary every protection he can think of against rats because he knows if the grain is there the rats will try to get in; and if they get in, they'll spoil the grain. He knows this because of the nature of rats with grain. He doesn't have to find a particular rat spoiling a particular grain of wheat in order to need protection for his granary or know that he needs it.

Now every member of the Communist Party has been indoctrinated, has been put under discipline, has been accepted by the party as loyal and reliable, and has accepted as one of his personal obligations to the party the responsibility of using any position he gets for the furtherance of the party's purposes and objectives, on his own initiative where he is not given instructions and in strict accordance with party instructions when he is instructed. A Communist teacher is by definition incapable of exercising academic freedom because he is not permitted by his obligation to the party to teach anything contrary to the party line or to take any action which would help to induce an independent state of mind or a freedom of choice or a capacity for clear thinking in his students. His whole job is to do those things and to teach those things which will help the party obtain its objective of gaining the minds of the students, gaining control over them where possible, advancing its propaganda and making new recruits for the party.

MARILYN MANION. What about Communist speakers being allowed to appear on college campuses?

Mr. SOURWINE. A Communist has the same right of free speech in this country that you or I have. But that right of free speech does not embrace an obligation to make public funds available to the Communists, nor public facilities available to a Communist for the purpose of spreading his message among youth. On the contrary, the fathers and mothers who pay taxes for the education of their children have a right to be assured that their tax money will not be used for the purpose of teaching those children things which are wrong.

COMMUNISTS EXPLOIT NAIVETE OF YOUTH

MARILYN MANION. Approximately how many tax supported schools and colleges have been used in the last few years as platforms for Communist speakers?

Mr. SOURWINE. I can't give you a precise number but I think it's safe to say not less than 200 and probably not more than 400, although I think the total number of appearances by Communists on college campuses may have exceeded 400 substantially.

MARILYN MANION. Why is it that this Communist propaganda among our young people is so effective? Is there any possibility that these students are being conditioned beforehand—made vulnerable for Communist recruitment?

Mr. SOURWINE. I think a categorical answer would be "no," but it would be a misleading answer. A great deal of the Communist purpose in its activity on the campus is to condition the students. And in a sense, students are preconditioned by their youth, by their natural youthful aggressiveness, by their natural youthful idealism, and by their youthful naivete, their lack of sophistication.

The finest mechanical or electronic computer that the mind of man can conceive of will give the wrong answers or break down if false data is fed into it, at least until the computer has been given a sufficient amount of true data to develop within the computer an ability to reject that which is false. The human mind is the finest computer that was ever made. The same thing is true of the human mind, however. If false basic premises are fed into it, and it works properly, false answers will come out.

If false premises are fed into it in contradiction to truth which is already there, at a time when the mind as a computer has not had enough data to achieve enough sophistication to make the choice and reject the false, the result is confusion or even mental breakdown—just as a computer would break down. And it's by reaching for the youth at a time when they are particularly vulnerable that the Communist Party hopes to make major gains through its campaign addressed to college campuses.

MARILYN MANION. Thank you, Mr. Sourwine. As chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, you know of what you speak. And I know that you've enlightened the members of our radio audience in this interview. Ladies and gentlemen, I return you to my father, Dean Manion, in South Bend, Ind.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Marilyn, and thank you, Mr. Sourwine, for this informative and helpful interview about communism and other things.

FREE POSTAGE FOR OUR AMERICAN TROOPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there are several thousand young American boys serving their country in Vietnam. The war seems to be escalating rapidly.

I have visited with some of the returning troops—and have also received mail—which indicates that one thing that would really give them a great deal of encouragement would be for Congress to vote them free postage while in Vietnam.

We can well imagine what happens to these boys when they come out of the jungle mountains, dripping with perspiration, and run down to the canteen to buy a few stamps, which they put in their pockets, which are damp, so that they will have enough stamps to write letters to their loved ones.

It seems to me that this is one thing we should be taking prompt action on. It is not an unusual procedure. It was followed in World War II and in the Korean conflict—and we should do the same thing now.

S. 230

AN ACT

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2300

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 28, 1965

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accord-

ance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

NAVIGATION

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts; House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House

Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered 226, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,112,000;

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House

Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000: *Provided,* That in order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $563,000;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000: *Provided,* That any funds appropriated for the construction of this project shall not be utilized until such time as the Indiana dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by Act of Congress.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington: Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $676,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Num-

bered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, as an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

BEACH EROSION

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,400;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

SEC. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, or in other sections of this Act, subsequent to the initiation of the studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of October 23, 1962 (Public Law 874, Eighty-seventh Congress), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act: *Provided further,* That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects herein adopted: *And provided further,* That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other projects of higher priority for improvements.

SEC. 103. That section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section

104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. (a) That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian water milfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies: *Provided,* That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations: *Provided further,* That costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section may be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be

necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

SEC. 104. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation

and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

SEC. 106. Title I of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Con-

gress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided,* That the authorization for any flood control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers

in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided,* That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further,* That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further,* That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

SAINT JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John

River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Still River at Danbury, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,300,000.

The project for flood protection on the Housatonic and Naugatuck Rivers at Derby, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,800,000.

NEW ENGLAND-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

LONG ISLAND SOUND AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

NEW YORK-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

NEUSE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the rceommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

FLINT RIVER BASIN

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items: *Provided,* That said projects shall be prosecuted within the monetary authorization made available for the comprehensive plan.

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

SOUTH ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized subtantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

PHILLIPPI CREEK BASIN, FLORIDA

The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at a cost not to exceed $181,109,100, and the authorization for the lower Mississippi River project is hereby increased accordingly: *Provided,* That this authorization shall not be made available for the prosecution of any

projects except those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress: *Provided further*, That any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928: *And provided further*, That the pumping plant in the Red River Backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $56,922,000.

OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

RED RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and Tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

GULF OF MEXICO

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with

the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,290,000.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including

in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and Tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000: *Provided,* That such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for

the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $278,635,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress. at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka

Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Devils Jumps Reservoir, Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $151,000,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided*, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the

pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further*, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further*, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000: *Provided*, That prior to initiation of construction the Department of the Army will prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such

reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000: *Provided,* That local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized sub-

stantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for flood protection on the Iowa River at Marshalltown, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,670,000.

The project for flood protection on the Cedar River at Waterloo, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,900,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Maumee River at and in the vicinity of Findlay, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 158, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,317,000.

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Num-

bered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

EEL RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,030,000.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

SEC. 204. (a) In the prosecution of improvements of rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such improvements are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or any subsequent similar Act requiring the designation of an area by the Secretary of Commerce as a condition of such assistance,

the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects within such areas.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction: *Provided*, That in the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and: *Provided further*, That the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs

shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie: *Provided,* That such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of En-

gineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande River and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drains directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coast lines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion

of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

SEC. 208. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

Passed the Senate July 27, 1965.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

Secretary.

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2300

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

JULY 28, 1965

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
R INFORMATION ONLY;
T TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Sept. 2, 1965
For actions of Sept. 1, 1965
89th-1st; No. 161

CONTENTS

Accounting.....36
Appropriations.....38
Beef prices.....39
Committee assignments...17
Contracts.....5
Dairy.....15
Data processing.....16,26
Education.....13,18
Farm labor.....31
Farm program.....25
Federal expenditures....22
FHA loans.....2
Foreign agriculture.....10
Foreign service.....4
Foreign trade.....11,23,37
Legislative accomplishments.....12
Legislative process.....26
Loans.....2
Monopolies.....35
Natural resources.....24
Nomination.....20
Opinion poll.....15,25
Personnel.....14,19,34
Political activity.....14
Poverty.....8,28
Procurement.....5
Public works.....7
Recreation.....29,39
Reports.....36
Research.....3
Retirement.....34
Science.....3
Stockpiling.....6
Supergrades.....19
Transportation.....27,33
Water pollution.....30
Water resources.....30,32
Water systems.....2,15
Watersheds.....21
Wheat.....1,15,23
Wilderness.....29

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee cleared bill to extend International Wheat Agreement Act and deferred action on bill to expand various FHA loan authorities. Rep. Battin criticized increase in retail prices of beef. Rep. Betts introduced and discussed bill to require GAO approval of accounting systems.

HOUSE

1. WHEAT. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 2294, to extend the operation of the International Wheat Agreement Act until July 31, 1966. p. 21656

2. LOANS. The Rules Committee deferred action on granting a rule on H. R. 10232, the FHA loan expansion bill (p. D874). As reported by the Agriculture Committee this bill includes provisions as follows:

Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to associations, including corporations not operated for profit, and public and quasi-public agencies to provide for, in addition to present authority, the installation or improvement of facilities for the use and control of water, including

central water systems, and the installation or improvement of drainage or waste disposal facilities, primarily designed to serve farmers, ranchers, farm tenants, farm laborers, and other rural residents. Authorizes the Secretary to make grants aggregating not to exceed $50 million in any fiscal year to these agencies and associations to assist in financing specific projects for the development, storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water or the collection, treatment, or disposal of waste in rural areas (grants may not exceed 50 percent of the development cost of the project). Provides that no loan or grant shall be made which will cause the unpaid principal indebtedness of any association to exceed $4 million at any one time.

Authorizes the Secretary to make grants aggregating not to exceed $5 million in any fiscal year to public bodies or other such agencies to prepare comprehensive plans for the development of water or sewer systems in rural areas which do not have funds available for immediate undertaking of the preparation of such plans.

Increases from $200 million to $450 million the limit on FHA insured loans in any one year; repeals present provisions prohibiting agreements by the Secretary to purchase such insured loans in less than 3 years from the date the note; permits the Secretary to fix the insurance charge retained by him from borrowers' payments and the portion of such charge deposited in the insurance fund; and increases the amount of loans made from the insurance fund which the Secretary can hold at any one time for future sale from $25 million to $50 million.

3. RESEARCH. Passed with amendment S. 949, to authorize the Department of Commerce to institute a 3-year program of matching grants to States in a cooperative effort to disseminate the findings of science and technology throughout American business, commerce, and industrial establishments as a means of promoting industrial and economic growth, after substituting the language of a similar bill, H. R. 3420, which was passed earlier as reported. H. R. 3420 was tabled. pp. 21657-72

4. FOREIGN SERVICE. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 6277, to amend the Foreign Service Act so as to establish a single personnel system within the Department of State, U. S. Information Agency, and Agency for International Development. pp. 21656-7

5. PROCUREMENT; CONTRACTS. The Education and Labor Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10238, to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies (H. Rept. 948). p. 21724

6. STOCKPILING. A subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 6852, with amendment, to authorize disposal of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile; H. R. 10516, to authorize disposal of vegetable tannin extracts from the national stockpile; H. R. 10714, to authorize disposal of colemanite from the supplemental stockpile; and H. R. 10715, to authorize disposal of chemical grade chromite from the supplemental stockpile. p. D872

7. PUBLIC WORKS. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment S. 2300, to authorize the constructions, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. p. D873

OBSCENE MATTERS

Committee on Education and Labor: Select Subcommittee on Education held a hearing on H.R. 7465, regarding noxious and obscene matters. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OLDER WORKERS BUREAU

Committee on Education and Labor: Select Subcommittee on Labor continued hearings on H.R. 10634, and related bills, to establish a Bureau of Older Workers in the Department of Labor. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs met in executive session and approved for full committee action a clean bill in lieu of H. Res. 542, to express the sense of the House of Representatives declaring a policy of the United States relative to the intervention of the International Communistic Movement in the Western Hemisphere.

Prior to the executive session, in an open hearing, the subcommittee continued hearings on bills relating to the Communist threat in Latin America. Testimony was heard from Representatives Flood and Ichord.

U.S.-OWNED FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy continued hearings to determine the utilization of excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies in certain countries. Testimony was heard from Representative Reuss, and William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

CONGO

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa met in executive session for a briefing with G. McMurtrie Godley, U.S. Ambassador to Congo.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE MOVING EXPENSES

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization held a hearing on H.R. 10607, providing for reimbursement of certain moving and storage expenses of Federal employees. Testimony was heard from Representative Kunkel; John W. Macy, Director, Civil Service Commission; F. Henry Barclay, Assistant General Counsel, General Accounting Office; Elmer B. Staats, Bureau of the Budget; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE AFFAIRS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Met to present a resolution to a staff employee.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation concluded hearings on H.R. 4671, and related bills, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Met in executive session on pending business. No announcements were made.

CLAIMS BILLS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 2 met in executive session and acted on several private claims bills.

COPYRIGHT REVISION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 3 continued hearings on H.R. 4347, and related bills, regarding copyright revision. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

JUDGESHIPS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 5 held a hearing on omnibus judgeship bills. Testimony was heard from Representative McCulloch; Chief Judge John Biggs, Jr., U.S. Court of Appeals, Third Judicial Circuit; and Chief Judge Harvey M. Johnson, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial Circuit.

OCEANOGRAPHY BUSINESS

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Subcommittee on Oceanography met in executive session on pending legislation. No announcements were made.

POST OFFICE RATES

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Subcommittee on Postal Rates held a hearing on H.R. 9058, and related bills, to authorize the free use of the mails in making reports required by law of certain payments to others. Testimony was heard from Representative Pool; and departmental and public witnesses.

PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Public Works: Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House S. 2300 (amended), to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control.

RIVERS AND HARBORS—FLOOD CONTROL BILL

Committee on Public Works: Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors met in executive session on the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. No announcements were made.

U.N. PARTICIPATION ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule with 1 hour of debate on S. 1903, regarding U.N. Participation Act amendments. Testimony was heard from Representatives Fascell and Kelly.

FOREIGN SERVICE ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule with 2 hours of debate on H.R. 6277, regarding Foreign Service Act amendments. Testimony was heard from Representatives Hays, Adair, Thomson of Wisconsin, and Kelly.

WHEAT AGREEMENT ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule with 1 hour of debate on S. 2294, regarding the extension of Wheat Agreement Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Ashley and Mize.

SANITATION FACILITIES

Committee on Rules: Action was deferred on H.R. 10232, regarding rural water and sanitation facilities. Testimony was heard from Representative Poage.

COLD WAR GI BILL

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Continued hearings on S. 9, and related bills, the Cold War GI bill. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

JUDICIAL RETIREMENT

Committee on Ways and Means: Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House H.R. 8445, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

BILLS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

New Laws

(*For last listing of public laws, see* DIGEST, *p. D867, August 31, 1965*)

H.J. Res. 95, to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as "Lake Meredith." Signed August 31, 1965 (P.L. 89–153).

H.R. 881, to authorize establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument. Signed August 31, 1965 (P.L. 89–154).

H.R. 7181, authorizing commemoration of certain historical events in Kansas with appropriate markers. Signed August 31, 1965 (P.L. 89–155).

H.R. 7765, fiscal 1966 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. Signed August 31, 1965 (P.L. 89–156).

H.R. 7596, providing temporary authority for increasing the number of officers who may serve on active duty in the grades of colonel or lieutenant colonel in the Air Force. Signed August 31, 1965 (P.L. 89–157).

H.R. 89, authorizing establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Signed September 1, 1965 (P.L. 89–158).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2

(*All meetings are open unless otherwise designated*)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, executive, on S. 1702 and H.R. 9811, proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, 10 a.m., 324 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, executive, to mark up H.R. 10586, Labor-HEW supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1966, 10 a.m., 1223 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services, open and executive, on committee business, 10:30 a.m., 212 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, open and executive, on the nomination of Hobart Taylor, Jr., of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, 10 a.m., 5302 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Finance, executive, on H.R. 7502, tax treatment of losses suffered from major disasters, and amendments thereto, and on other pending matters, 10 a.m., 2221 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, executive, on S. 1681, proposed Uniform Relocation Act, 10 a.m., 3302 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Public Works, open and executive, on the nomination of Eugene P. Foley, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce (new position), 11 a.m., 4200 New Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grain, on H.R. 9743, and related bills, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, 10 a.m., 1301 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, executive, on Foreign Assistance Act, 10 a.m., H–140 U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on the Interior, executive, on pending business, 1 p.m., H–307 U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee No. 4, to consider H.R. 266, regarding travel allowance, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn House Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, to continue on S. 1698, and related bills, to exempt bank mergers approved under the Bank Merger Act from operation of the antitrust laws, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn House Office Building.

Committee on Education and Labor, Select Subcommittee on Labor, on H.R. 10634, regarding the employment problem of the older American worker, 10 a.m., 2261 Rayburn House Office Building.

5. LANDS. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee consideration without amendment S. 2182, to revise the boundaries of the Jewel Cave National Monument, S. Dak. p. D902

6. DISASTER RELIEF; TAXATION. The "Daily Digest" states that the Finance Committee "announced that it has postponed until the next session of Congress further consideration of H. R. 7502, relating to tax treatment of losses suffered from major disasters." p. D902

7. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Gruening expressed opposition to further Public Law 480 assistance to Egypt until it "stops its agressive actions" against other countries. pp. 22537-8

8. PATENTS. Sen. Nelson inserted an article on Sen. Morse's testimony before the Small Business Committee on bills to formulate a uniform patent policy, "Morse Calls Patent Bill Clause Effort to Steal Billions." p. 22533

9. RECREATION. Sen. Nelson inserted items in support of his proposal to establish the Apostle Islands national lakeshore in northern Wisc. pp. 22533-5

HOUSE

10. FOREIGN SERVICE. Passed with amendments H. R. 6277, to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 so as to facilitate the establishment of a single personnel system within the Department of State, the U. S. Information Agency, and the Agency for International Development. pp. 22369-98

11. PUBLIC WORKS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment S. 2300, to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, and flood control (H. Rept. 973). p. 22436

12. TRADE FAIRS. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 30, to provide for the participation of the U. S. in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla. (H. Rept. 974); and without amendment H. R. 9247, to provide for participation of the U. S. in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition, San Antonio, Tex. (H. Rept. 975). p. 22436

13. TARIFF. The conferees on H. R. 7969, to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the U. S., and H. R. 5768, to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk, were given until midnight, Mon. Sept. 13, to file a report. p. 22398

14. PERSONNEL. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 8469, to increase the annuities of retired Federal employees and to revise the method of determining cost-of-living increases in retirement annuities (p. 22365). This bill will now be sent to the President.

15. WATERSHEDS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Public Works Committee approved plans for works of improvement on the following watershed projects: Cooper Creek, Ark.; Limestone Stream, Maine; Long Creek, Miss.; Tuscumbia River, Miss. and Tenn.; Grindstone-Lost-Muddy Creek, Mo.; Stewarts Creek-Loville Creek, N. C. and Va.; Upper Elk Creek, Okla.; Ferrod, Utah; Choccolocco Creek, Ala.; Little Clear Creek, Ark.; Upper Choptank River, Del. and Md.; Grove River, Ga.; South Fork Broad River, Ga.; supplement to Busseron, Ind.; Little Raccoon Creek, Ind.; Timber Creek, Kans.; supplement to SuAsCo, Mass.;

"(6) Both county and community would be required to be protected from adverse economic effect.

"(7) Wildlife service payments and advisory board provided for.

"TITLE VI—COTTON"

"(1) Domestic allotment program continued for 4 years with payments of 25 percent of basic support for 1966 to those keeping within their domestic allotments, 20 to 40 percent for subsequent years; a minimum farm domestic allotment equal to the smaller of 10 acres or the farm allotment; and a minimum national domestic allotment equal to 65 percent of the national acreage allotment.

"(2) Four-year program of payments to other than producers and domestic users at 3 cents per pound.

"(3) CCC export sales or subsidies required to be put on a bid or offer and acceptance basis without advance announcement of prices or subsidy rates (effective for 4 years).

"TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS"

"(1) Method prescribed for apportioning allotments among divided farms.

"(2) Authority to use projected yields in lieu of normal yields for all commodities. Projected yield not to be less than actual yields proved by producer, unless the use of such proved yield for a commodity will cause inequities among producers.

"(3) Sense of Congress that no restriction with respect to transportation in American vessels is to be applied to the commercial exportation of agricultural commodities if not applied to the exportation of other commodities.

"(4) Authority to purchase dairy products at market prices to meet program requirements for schools, domestic relief distribution, community action, foreign distribution, and other programs when the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks are insufficient.

"(5) Study of full-time commercial family farms and the extent to which farm programs are of benefit to such farmers.

"(6) Determinations by the Secretary of Agriculture on the amounts and availability of land, labor, material, or services needed for the production and harvesting of any agricultural crop. These determinations shall be accepted by all agencies of the United States."

2. WHEAT; FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Dodd criticized proposals to remove shipping restrictions on sales of wheat to Communitt countries (pp. 22475-99, and submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the farm bill to provide for the establishment of a Select Joint Committee of Congress to Study East-West Trade (p.22482). Sens. Hart and Mondale expressed disagreement with Sen. Dodd's position (pp. 22490-3).

3. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Passed without amendment H. R. 10775, the military construction authorization bill which includes an item for payment of CCC for certain family housing which was financed from the sale of surplus commodities. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 22440

4. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 10586, making supplemental appropriations to the Departments of Labor and HEW, including $1,723,000 for the Labor Dept. for activities relating to admission and employment of foreign agricultural workers and $7,000,000 for the new Administration on Aging in HEW. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 22365-9, 22457-8

RIVER AND HARBOR, BEACH EROSION, FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, AND WATER SUPPLY

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

ON

S. 2300

A BILL AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

SEPTEMBER 9, 1965.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

53-113 WASHINGTON : 1965

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland, *Chairman*

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
W. J. BRYAN DORN, South Carolina
DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina
ARNOLD OLSEN, Montana
J. RUSSELL TUTEN, Georgia
RALPH J. RIVERS, Alaska
RAY ROBERTS, Texas
ROBERT A. EVERETT, Tennessee
RICHARD D. McCARTHY, New York
JAMES KEE, West Virginia
JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, Iowa
ROBERT E. SWEENEY, Ohio
JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey
KEN W. DYAL, California

WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
JOHN F. BALDWIN, California
WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Ohio
JOHN C. KUNKEL, Pennsylvania
JAMES R. GROVER, JR., New York
JAMES C. CLEVELAND, New Hampshire
DON H. CLAUSEN, California
CHARLES A. HALLECK, Indiana
CHARLOTTE T. REID, Illinois
ROBERT C. McEWEN, New York
JAMES D. MARTIN, Alabama

Committee Staff

EDWARD J. McNEAL, *Staff Director*
RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, *Chief Counsel*
JOSEPH R. BRENNAN, *Engineer-Consultant*
CLIFTON W. ENFIELD, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEES

RIVERS AND HARBORS

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota, *Chairman*

HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina
RALPH J. RIVERS, Alaska
RAY ROBERTS, Texas
W. J. BRYAN DORN, South Carolina
RICHARD D. McCARTHY, New York
JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, Iowa
ROBERT E. SWEENEY, Ohio
JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey

WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Ohio
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
DON H. CLAUSEN, California
CHARLES A. HALLECK, Indiana
ROBERT C. McEWEN, New York
JAMES D. MARTIN, Alabama

FLOOD CONTROL

ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama, *Chairman*

JIM WRIGHT, Texas
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma
ARNOLD OLSEN, Montana
W. J. BRYAN DORN, South Carolina
DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina
RAY ROBERTS, Texas
ROBERT A. EVERETT, Tennessee
JAMES KEE, West Virginia

JOHN F. BALDWIN, California
WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Ohio
JOHN C. KUNKEL, Pennsylvania
JAMES R. GROVER, JR., New York
DON H. CLAUSEN, California
CHARLOTTE T. REID, Illinois
JAMES D. MARTIN, Alabama

INDEX

PROJECT OR ITEM

TITLE I. NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

Page

Section 101. Statement of Congress and study authorization

TITLE II. FLOOD CONTROL 10

Section 201. Authorization of projects by committee resolution 12
Section 202. Provisions of local cooperation 12
Section 203. Procedure for submitting reports 12
Section 204. Project authorizations 12
Flood control:
Arkansas River, Great Bend, and vicinity, Kansas 14
Arkansas River, Las Animas, Colo 15
Bayou Bodcau, Ark. and La 17
Big Creek, Hays, Kans 19
Big Sandy River and tributaries, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia 20
Big Sioux River, Iowa and S. Dak 23
Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak 24
Biscayne Bay, Fla 26
Central and southern Hendry County, Fla 28
Central and southern Southwest Dade County, Fla 29
Caddo Dam, La 30
Chagrin River, Ohio 32
Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers, Iowa and Mo 35
Chartiers Creek, Pa 37
Cheat River, W. Va 38
Crutcho Creek, Okla 40
Des Moines, Iowa 41
East Rockaway Inlet, N.Y 42
East St. Louis, Ill 44
Eel River, Calif 45
El Paso, Tex 47
Elizabeth River, N.J 49
Fishing River, Mo 51
Flint River, Ga 52
Gila River at Phoenix, Ariz 54
Gila River-Indian Bend Wash, Ariz 55
Gila River-Santa Rosa Wash, Ariz 56
Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana 58
Grand River at Grandville, Mich 60
Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa 61
Grande Ronde River, Oreg 64
Highland Bayou, Tex 66
Hocking River Basin, Ohio 67
Housatonic River, Conn., N.Y., and Mass 68
Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa 69
James River, N. Dak 71
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington 73
John Martin Reservoir, Colo 74
John Redmond Reservoir, Grand River, Kans 74
Kaskaskia River levees, Illinois 76
Lake Pontchartrain, La 77
Lee Creek, Ark. and Okla 80

Section 204. Project authorizations—Continued
Flood control—Continued Page
Little Colorado River, Winslow, Ariz 81
Little Nemaha River, Nebr 82
Little Rock levees, Arkansas 83
Lytle and Warm Creeks, Calif 84
Martins Fork Reservoir, Ky 86
Mississippi River and tributaries 87
Morgan City and vicinity, Louisiana 94
Napa River, Calif 96
Neuse River Basin, N.C 97
New Bern, N.C 98
Ocracoke Island, N.C 100
Ouachita River and tributaries, Monroe, La 101
Pat Mayse Reservoir, Tex 103
Phillippi Creek, Fla 103
Pine Bluff sewer outfall, Arkansas 105
Platte River, Mo. and Iowa 106
Rahway River, N.J 108
Roseau River, Minn 109
San Diego River, Calif 111
Sandy Lick Creek, Pa 112
Sawmill River and tributaries, New York 113
Scotts Creek, Calif 115
Shidler Reservoir-Salt Creek, Okla 116
Skunk River, Iowa 117
Sonoma Creek, Calif 119
St. Francis River Drainage District No. 7, Arkansas 120
St. John River (Dickey and Lincoln School), Maine 122
Staten Island, N.Y 123
Stratford, Conn 125
Sun River at Great Falls, Mont 126
Tahquitz Creek-White Water River, Calif 126
Taylors Bayou, Tex 128
Trinidad Dam, Colo 130
Wabash River and tributaries, Illinois and Indiana No. 1 130
Wabash River and tributaries, Illinois and Indiana No. 2 132
Walnut River and tributaries, Kansas 135
Waurika, Okla 137
Westerly, R.I 138
White Oak Bayou, Tex 140
Willow Creek, Oreg 141
Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Illinois 143
Yuba River-Bullards Bar, Calif 144
Zumbro River, Minn 145
Section 205. Scioto River, Ohio 146
Section 206. Study authorization 147
Section 207. Surveys 147
Section 208. Yakima River at Ellensburg, Wash 147
Section 209. Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Tex 147
Section 210. Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tenn 147
Section 211. R. D. Bailey (Justice Reservoir), Guyandot River, W. Va 148
Section 212. Calispell Creek, Wash 148
Section 213. New York State comprehensive planning 148
Section 214. Leases (recreation facilities) 148
Section 215. San Francisco Bay, Calif 149
Section 216. Milford Dam and Reservoir, Republican River, Kans 149
Section 217. Eel River, Calif 149
Section 218. Contracts 150
Section 219. Small flood control project authorization 150
Section 220. Clarence Cannon (Joanna) Dam and Reservoir, Mo 150
Section 221. Title II designation 150

TITLE III. RIVERS AND HARBORS

Page

Section 301. Project authorizations 150
Navigation:
Alpena Harbor, Mich 152
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio 153
Bayou La Batre, Ala 154
Bodega Bay, Calif 155
Broward County, Fla 157
Burns Waterway, Ind 159
Cape Fear River, N.C 161
Cedar River Harbor, Mich 163
Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, Va 165
Chetco River, Oreg 166
Chocolate Bayou, Tex 167
Crescent City, Calif 169
East Pass Channel of Gulf of Mexico, Fla 170
Edmonds Harbor, Wash 172
Frankfort Harbor, Mich 173
Hampton Creek, Va 174
Hawaiian Islands (coast of) for small craft, Hawaii 175
Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii 177
Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii 178
Houston Ship Channel (Green Bayou), Tex 180
Indiana Harbor, Ind 181
Jacksonville Harbor, Fla 183
Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii 185
Lexington Harbor, Mich 186
Lorain Harbor, Ohio 188
Mermantau River, La 188
Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoals, Va 190
New York and New Jersey Channels, N.Y. and N.J 191
New York Harbor anchorages, New York 193
Oceanside Harbor, Calif 194
Potomac River debris removal, Maryland and Virginia 196
Perdido Pass Channel, Ala 197
Ponce de Leon Inlet, Fla 198
Port Orford, Oreg 200
Providence River and Harbor, R.I 201
Rocky River and Harbor, Ohio 202
Rondout Harbor, N.Y 203
Saginaw River, Mich 205
San Francisco Bay to Stockton, Calif 206
San Luis Harbor (Port San Luis), Calif 208
Savannah Harbor, Ga 210, 211
Shrewsbury River, N.J 213
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg 214
Tred Avon River, Md 217
Trinity River, Tex 218
West Harbor, Ohio 222
Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Mass 215
Beach erosion control:
Atlantic City, N.J 224
Cliff Walk, Newport, R.I 225
Duval County, Fla 227
Evanston, Ill 228
Fort Pierce, Fla 230
Haleiwa Beach, Hawaii 231
Hunting Island Beach, S.C 232
Perth Amboy, N.J 233
Waikiki Beach, Hawaii 234
Section 302. Obnoxious aquatic plant growths 236
Section 303. Sunbury, Pa 236
Section 304. Surveys 236
Section 305. James River, Va 236
Section 306. Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (PIANC) 237

Page
Section 307. East River, New York County, N.Y. 237
Section 308. River Raisin, Monroe County, Mich. 238
Section 309. Relocation of local governmental facilities. 238
Section 310. Small navigation and beach erosion control project authorization. 239
Section 311. Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. 239
Section 312. Chesapeake Bay Basin. 239
Section 313. City of Clinton Bridge Commission. 240
Section 314. Muscatine Bridge Commission. 240
Section 315. Civil works projects law, revision, and codification. 240
Section 316. Reimbursement study. 240
Section 317. Title III designation. 241

89TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 973

RIVERS AND HARBORS, FLOOD CONTROL, WATER SUPPLY, AND RELATED PURPOSES

SEPTEMBER 9, 1965.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. JONES of Alabama, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2300]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

AMENDMENT

The amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill and inserts in lieu thereof a substitute which appears in the reported bill in italic type. Because of the numerous projects that were transmitted to the Congress subsequent to the close of Senate action and because of a number of changes that were made in S. 2300, the committee felt in reporting the bill that the necessarily large number of amendments would be difficult and complex and therefore used the method of reporting it with a single amendment which is a new bill.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 2300, as amended, is an omnibus river and harbor, flood control, and water supply bill similar to those which have been passed in preceding years at intervals from 2 to 4 years apart. The last major omnibus bill was in 1962. In the 3 years since, a number of reports have been submitted to the Congress by the Corps of Engineers on navigation, beach erosion, flood control, and related purposes. A total of 144 individual projects are included in the bill at a total

estimated Federal cost of $1,970,228,000. The projects are located in 41 States and cover all types of works under the jurisdiction of of the committee and within the province of the Corps of Engineers.

Hearings

The committee held 5 weeks of hearings on this bill. This was in addition to those held by the Senate. With respect to the projects on which complete hearings were held by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate the committee heard a brief summarization given by the Corps of Engineers. With respect to those projects which had been submitted subsequent to the Senate hearings the committee held full public hearings and all those who desired were given an opportunity to testify. The committee also held hearings on a number of projects or items about which there was either controversy or which, for some other reason, the committee felt should be considered in some detail.

Breakdown of Bill

The bill is divided into three titles. Title I is water supply for the Northeastern United States. Title II is flood control and related functions. Title III is rivers and harbors (navigation) and related functions. In titles II and III there are, in addition to the individual projects which are recommended for authorization, a number of individual sections dealing with items of general or specific policy and with provisions for authorizing the Corps of Engineers to carry on general investigations on new projects.

Annual Omnibus Bill

The committee intends to report an omnibus bill every year hereafter rather than every 2 to 4 years. The committee is firmly convinced that this procedure is necessary for several reasons. The long lapse between time of authorization of a survey report and authorization of a favorable project indicates that it would be advisable to reduce this by the amount of time between authorization bills. If a project has waited 7 to 10 years before it is submitted to Congress then it seems unfair to require a further delay of 2, 3, or 4 years if the transmittal of the report should happen to be immediately following the enactment of an omnibus bill. The need for these works is present at the time that they are recommended favorably. The system of permitting several years to elapse before action is taken on them seems unfair to the person who is threatened by floods, to the shipper who is deprived of water transportation, and to the many other beneficiaries which will be served by the project purposes.

A second reason is the question of basin authorizations. For a number of years now the committee has been under tremendous pressure to enact increases in basin authorizations because of the fact that appropriations have begun to reach the monetary ceilings. In 1963 the situation was so bad that contracts had to be canceled or deferred with increased cost to the Government, to local interests and to the local contractors. Earlier this year the same situation threatened and, for that reason, the committee approved and the Congress enacted a bill to provide for a stopgap emergency basin

authorization of 2 years. It would be far wiser to have an annual authorization bill which could include reasonable increases in basin authorization sufficient to carry the programs in these basins ahead for the necessary time period.

LENGTH OF TIME REQUIRED FOR SUBMITTAL OF SURVEY REPORTS

As mentioned above, a long period of time is required between authorization of a survey investigation and submittal of a report to Congress. The average time for this action has been estimated at something in excess of 10 years. The committee feels that this is unnecessarily long and that the Corps of Engineers is the only major construction agency which requires this lengthy period to submit its recommendations to the Congress. The committee believes that this process can be streamlined. The committee feels that too much time is being taken at every step in the process from the district engineer level to the Chief of Engineers. The committee is of the opinion that certain stages in the process such as review by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors might well be reduced. The committee desires that the Chief of Engineers submit to the committee his recommendations as to what might be done to streamline this procedure early during the next session of Congress.

MONETARY SUMMARY OF PROJECTS AND LIST OF PROJECTS BY STATES

The following tables summarize the number of projects contained in the bill, together with the total estimated Federal cost. The projects are itemized in detail in sections 204 and 301.

	Number	Amount
Title II: Flood control and multiple-purpose projects	88	$1,622,159,000
Title III:		
Navigation projects	47	341,388,000
Beach erosion control projects	9	6,681,000
Total, title III	56	348,069,000
Grand total, projects	144	1,970,228,000

List of projects by States

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Alabama:	
Navigation:	
Bayou La Batre	$262,000
Perdido Pass	625,000
Total	887,000
Flood control	None
Total, Alabama	887,000
Alaska	None
Arizona:	
Flood control:	
Indian Bend Wash	7,250,000
Phoenix	58,310,000
Santa Rosa Wash	6,430,000
Winslow	2,775,000
Total, Arizona	74,765,000

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Arkansas (see also, Mississippi):	
Flood control:	
Lee Creek. (See also, Oklahoma.)	$10, 000, 000
Little Rock levees	363, 000
Pine Bluff sewer outfall. (Project modification.)	
St. Francis Drainage Levee District No. 7	1, 372, 000
Total, Arkansas	11, 735, 000
California:	
Navigation:	
Bodega Bay	853, 000
Crescent City	1, 980, 000
Oceanside Harbor	Maintenance
Port San Luis	6, 360, 000
San Francisco Bay to Stockton	46, 853, 000
Total	56, 046, 000
Flood control:	
Eel River	13, 732, 000
Lytle and Warm Creeks	9, 750, 000
Napa River	14, 950, 000
San Diego River	14, 600, 000
Scotts Creek	9, 360, 000
Sonoma Creek	9, 400, 000
Tahquitz Creek	3, 442, 000
Yuba River, Bullards Bar	8, 979, 000
Total	84, 213, 000
Total, California	140, 259, 000
Colorado:	
Flood control:	
Arkansas River at Las Animas	1, 541, 000
John Martin Reservoir. (Project modification.)	
Trinidad Dam. (Project modification.)	
Total, Colorado	1, 541, 000
Connecticut:	
Flood control:	
Housatonic River	5, 100, 000
Stratford	4, 340, 000
Total, Connecticut	9, 440, 000
Delaware	None
Florida:	
Navigation:	
Broward County	1, 093, 000
Duval County	2, 266, 000
East Pass Channel	1, 151, 000
Fort Pierce	220, 000
Jacksonville Harbor	8, 484, 000
Ponce de Leon Inlet	1, 104, 000
Total	14, 318, 000

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Florida—Continued	
Flood control:	
Biscayne Bay	$1, 954, 000
Hendry County (central and southern Florida project)	(4, 986, 000)
Phillippi Creek	4, 592, 000
Southwest Dade County (central and southern Florida project)	(4, 903, 000)
Total	6, 546, 000
Total, Florida	20, 864, 000
Georgia:	
Navigation: Savannah Harbor	13, 669, 000
Flood control: Flint River	88, 653, 000
Total, Georgia	102, 322, 000
Hawaii:	
Navigation:	
Coasts of Hawaiian Islands	4, 737, 000
Haleiwa Beach	572, 000
Honokahau Harbor	680, 000
Honolulu Harbor-Barbers Point Harbor	9, 928, 000
Kawaihae Harbor	2, 291, 000
Waikiki Beach	2, 490, 000
Total	20, 698, 000
Flood control	None
Total, Hawaii	20, 698, 000
Idaho	None
Illinois:	
Navigation: Evanston	392, 000
Flood control:	
East St. Louis	6, 180, 000
Kaskaskia River levees	3, 498, 000
Wabash River. (See Indiana.)	
Wood River Drainage and Levee District	179, 000
Total	9, 857, 000
Total, Illinois	10, 249, 000
Indiana:	
Navigation:	
Burns Waterway	25, 000, 000
Indiana Harbor	96, 000
Total	25, 096, 000
Flood control:	
Wabash River Interim Report No. 1	44, 800, 000
Wabash River Interim Report No. 2	72, 900, 000
Total	117, 700, 000
Total, Indiana	142, 796, 000

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Iowa:	
Flood control:	
Iowa and Cedar Rivers	$17, 570, 000
Big Sioux River. (See also South Dakota)	6, 400, 000
Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.)	
Des Moines. (Project modification.)	
Grand River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.)	
Platte River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.)	
Skunk River	12, 893, 000
Total, Iowa	36, 863, 000
Kansas:	
Flood control:	
Big Creek at Hays	2, 702, 000
John Redmond Dam	730, 000
Walnut River	66, 036, 000
Arkansas River at Great Bend	4, 030, 000
Total, Kansas	73, 498, 000
Kentucky:	
Flood control:	
Martins Fork Reservoir	4, 860, 000
Big Sandy River	51, 491, 000
Total, Kentucky	56, 351, 000
Louisiana:	
Navigation: Mermentau River	2, 690, 000
Flood control:	
Bayou Bodcau	1, 524, 000
Caddo Dam	1, 934, 000
Grand Isle and vicinity	5, 500, 000
Lake Pontchartrain	56, 235, 000
Morgan City and vicinity	3, 049, 000
Ouachita River at Monroe	520, 000
Total	68, 762, 000
Total, Louisiana	71, 452, 000
Maine: Flood control: St. John River	227, 000, 000
Maryland:	
Navigation:	
Potomac River debris removal (see also Virginia)	Maintenance
Tred Avon River, Talbot County	323, 000
Total, Maryland	323, 000
Massachusetts:	
Navigation: Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor	12, 500, 000
Michigan:	
Navigation:	
Alpena Harbor	806, 000
Cedar River Harbor	664, 000
Frankfort Harbor	237, 000
Lexington Harbor	570, 000
Saginaw Harbor	437, 000
Total	2, 714, 000
Flood control: Grand River at Grandville	1, 373, 000
Total, Michigan	4, 087, 000

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Minnesota:	
Flood control:	
Big Stone Lake (see also South Dakota)	$3, 885, 000
Roseau River	2, 550, 000
Zumbro River	975, 000
Total, Minnesota	7, 410, 000
Mississippi:	
Mississippi River and tributaries (see also Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee)	181, 109, 000
Missouri:	
Flood control:	
Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers	9, 167, 000
Fishing River	7, 260, 000
Grand River	218, 009, 000
Mississippi River and tributaries. (See Mississippi.)	
Platte River (see also Iowa)	26, 889, 000
Total, Missouri	261, 325, 000
Montana:	
Sun River at Great Falls. (Project modification.)	
Nebraska:	
Flood control: Little Nemaha River	1, 524, 000
Nevada	None
New Hampshire	None
New Jersey:	
Navigation:	
Atlantic City	(1)
New York-New Jersey Channels. (See New York.)	
New York Harbor anchorages. (See New York.)	
Perth Amboy	82, 000
Shrewsbury River	4, 090, 000
Total	4, 172, 000
Flood control:	
Rahway River	1, 514, 000
Elizabeth River	9, 769, 000
Total	11, 283, 000
Total, New Jersey	15, 455, 000
New Mexico	None
New York:	
Navigation:	
New York, New Jersey Channels	2, 581, 000
New York Harbor anchorages	44, 852, 000
Rondout Harbor	20, 000
Total	47, 453, 000
Flood control:	
East Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay	32, 620, 000
Staten Island	6, 230, 000
Saw Mill River and tributaries	1, 924, 000
Total	40, 774, 000
Total, New York	88, 227, 000

[1] Periodic nourishment.

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
North Carolina:	
Navigation: Cape Fear River	$1, 510, 000
Flood control:	
Neuse Rivers	18, 600, 000
New Bern	10, 400, 000
Ocracoke Island	1, 636, 000
Total	30, 636, 000
Total, North Carolina	32, 146, 000
North Dakota:	
Flood control: James River	3, 083, 000
Ohio:	
Navigation:	
Ashtabula Harbor	1, 840, 000
Lorain Harbor. (Project modification.)	
Rocky River Harbor	235, 000
West Harbor	544, 000
Total	2, 619, 000
Flood control:	
Chagrin River	2, 200, 000
Hocking River Basin	4, 520, 000
Total	6, 720, 000
Total, Ohio	9, 339, 000
Oklahoma:	
Flood control:	
Crutcho Creek	1, 801, 000
Lee Creek. (See Arkansas.)	
Shidler Dam and Reservoir	6, 150, 000
Waurika Reservoir	418, 000
Total, Oklahoma	8, 369, 000
Oregon:	
Navigation:	
Chetco River	1, 308, 000
Port Orford	696, 000
Tillamook Bay and Bar	9, 000, 000
Total	11, 004, 000
Flood control:	
Grande Ronde	20, 440, 000
John Day lock and dam (see also Washington)	706, 000
Willow Creek	6, 680, 000
Total	27, 826, 000
Total, Oregon	38, 830, 000
Pennsylvania:	
Flood control:	
Chartiers Creek	12, 207, 000
Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois	1, 654, 000
Total, Pennsylvania	13, 861, 000

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Rhode Island:	
Navigation:	
Cliff Walk	$340,000
Providence River and Harbor	13,900,000
Total	14,240,000
Flood control: Westerly	3,287,000
Total, Rhode Island	17,527,000
South Carolina:	
Navigation: Hunting Island Beach	319,000
South Dakota:	
Flood control:	
Big Stone Lake. (See Minnesota.)	
Big Sioux River. (See Iowa.)	
Tennessee:	
Flood control: Mississippi River and tributaries. (See Mississippi.)	
Texas:	
Navigation:	
Chocolate Bayou	1,254,000
Houston Ship Channel (Green Bayou)	470,000
Trinity River	83,000,000
Total	84,724,000
Flood control:	
Buffalo Bayou (White Oak Bayou)	1,800,000
El Paso, El Paso County	12,493,000
Highland Bayou	3,500,000
Pat Mayse Reservoir (project modification)	310,000
Taylors Bayou	5,004,000
Total	23,107,000
Total, Texas	107,831,000
Utah	None
Vermont	None
Virginia:	
Navigation:	
Hampton Creek	Maintenance
Newport News Channel	7,095,000
Newport News-Norfolk Harbor	25,600,000
Potomac River debris removal. (See Maryland.)	
Total, Virginia	32,695,000
Washington:	
Navigation: Edmonds Harbor	Maintenance
Flood control: John Day lock and dam. (See Oregon.)	
West Virginia:	
Flood control:	
Cheat River	133,548,000
Big Sandy. (See Kentucky.)	
Wisconsin	None
Wyoming	None
Puerto Rico	None
Grand total	1,970,228,000

Analysis of Title I—Northeastern United States Water Supply

SECTION 101

Title I authorizes the preparation of a regional plan for meeting the future water supply needs of the vast megalopolis now developing along the Nation's northeastern seaboard. This plan would provide for a system of major reservoirs, aqueducts between major river basins, and purification plants.

The great drought from which this region still suffers has been a provident warning of things to come. It would be folly for the Nation to ignore this warning. Rather, we should learn from the disastrous consequence of the drought that the time has come when old policies must give way to new: Specifically, that the development of a megalopolis extending through a number of States will require the Federal Government to play a larger role in meeting the future needs of such areas for municipal and industrial water. We must, in other words, now cross another threshold in the progressive development of national policy. There is nothing essentially new about this. Many times in the past the Nation has recognized that with the growing complexity of society, problems have grown too difficult for solution by individuals or by local governmental units. In the field of water supply, for example, there was a time when each family supplied its own needs from spring, stream, or well. Then it became clear that collective action must supplant this primitive system. It was then that cities and towns assumed responsibility for supplying water to their citizens. Later, as metropolitan areas developed, cities and towns banded together to form metropolitan water districts. This adequately met needs for a long period of years, but now we face a situation that requires collective action at a still higher level—the level of the Federal Government. It is clearly revealed, for example, by the history of the Nation's efforts to meet its needs for flood control.

The committee is convinced that the Nation must now cross another threshold in the development of national policy. A continuous and vast urban area will eventually extend from the National Capital to Boston. Once this is recognized it will be clear that individual communities will no longer be able to meet the needs of their people for water to drink and to supply their factories. Already metropolitan regions like New York have had to reach out into other States for water. Soon the rapidly developing megalopolis will be seeking a unified system to supply all of its constituent parts. Water from many States will pass into this system and the Federal Government can no longer stand aloof. The Congress will be able to regulate the rate at which any regional plan it may adopt will be be put into effect by authorizing components thereof as they are needed, and through the appropriations process.

The committee wishes to make it clear that the preparation of a plan for meeting the long-range water supply needs of the northeastern megalopolis will not hinder the development of the comprehensive and multiple-purpose river basin plans called for by the recently enacted Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89–80). The preparation of plans for the use of the rivers of the northeast for all beneficial purposes will go forward under that act. The intent of

title I is that the plan for a northeastern water supply system shall be made up of major reservoirs encompassed by, and constituting integral components of, the plans formulated for the development of individual river basins. What the committee is seeking is an independent look at the transcendent water problem of the entire region, and a plan that will lead to the coordination of individual river basin plans in the light of that need.

The committee wishes to emphasize that the legislation envisioned in title I will result in no impairment of existing interstate compacts, such as the Delaware River compact, the New England compact, and others. On the other hand, the committee firmly believes that it will represent an additional tool for these groups to carry out the purposes contemplated in the legislation establishing these compacts.

In addition, it will aid greatly the expeditious cooperative enterprise which needs to be carried on and which is now being pioneered by the Delaware River Compact Commission, and by the other groups and associations in this category. By establishing the framework in which the Federal and State agencies can all work together there will be achieved a unity of purpose and common understanding of what is sought. It will provide a public forum where all vitally concerned with the staggering problem of water supply in the Northeastern States can be heard to the end that a plan may be developed which will solve one of the greatest domestic problems now facing the United States.

Further, this title provides that any works proposed must be specifically authorized by law. The usual procedure for formulation of such plans including coordination with State, Federal, and interstate agencies is a prerequisite to such enactment. The same procedures as contained in the present laws shall be applicable to such projects. It should be emphasized that the plan would be a combination of Federal and non-Federal works taking into account those features which may best be constructed or operated and maintained by non-Federal interests.

The committee believes that there is every need for a solution, both in the near future and in the long-range field of planning. The population density in these States and the associated problems must, in the opinion of the committee, make it apparent to every person that there is no time to waste.

In conclusion the committee feels that this legislation will be a step in achieving what long has been a national aspiration and one which has caused increasing apprehension on the part of many. There should be no misunderstanding about the fact that eventually there will be the need for similar planning in other parts of the Nation. The committee considers that the experience gained in the Northeast would be of tremendous value in indicating an approach in other regions where the need for an assured water supply is imminent.

This step forward in development of the water resources of the Nation marks a breakthrough similar to the step forward authorized by the Congress 29 years ago in the 1936 Flood Control Act. It complements and carries out the philosophy that was approved and enacted in the Appalachia bill, in the Public Works and Economic Development Act, and in other measures which have been approved by the committee during this session of the Congress.

53-113—65——2

Analysis of Title II—Flood Control

SECTION 201

The purpose of this section is to make possible more expeditious authorization of relatively small water resource development projects. Under existing legislation such projects generally are included in omnibus river and harbor or flood control bills and are subject to the same time-consuming authorization procedures as are major projects. This may delay action for several years on relatively minor projects that could have been in operation and meeting urgent needs throughout the period in which they are awaiting consideration by the Congress as a whole. Enactment of this section will make it possible for the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives to review such projects and to approve then by committee resolution. This is the procedure established by acts of Congress for the programs being carried out by the Department of Agriculture under the Watershed Flood Prevention Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 1001–1008) and the General Services Administration under the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 601–615). The procedure prescribed by those acts have made possible prompt congressional action on numerous projects throughout the Nation.

It is the intent of the committee that the usual survey procedure will apply to projects authorized under this section, and investigations and reports of surveys will be made pursuant to either an act of Congress or by resolution of one of the Committees on Public Works, as appropriate. This section does not affect, repeal, modify, or amend laws concerning small project authorization for river and harbor improvements (33 U.S.C. 577), flood control (33 U.S.C. 701s), shore and beach restoration and protection (33 U.S.C. 426g) or other water resource development purposes.

SECTION 202

This section is the same as that which has been included in the last several flood control acts. It continues the provisions of local cooperation which have been in effect for some time, and provides that project authorization shall expire if local cooperation is not forthcoming within 5 years after appropriate notification.

SECTION 203

This section is the same as that which has been included in the last several flood control acts. It continues the present procedure of submitting reports to the interested States and agencies prior to submission to Congress.

SECTION 204

This section summarizes the project authorizations for flood control, hurricane protection, and multiple-purpose works in title II. The initial table lists the projects, project document numbers, and estimated Federal costs. Pertinent information follows for each project.

Flood control projects

Project	Document No.	Federal cost of new work [1]
Arkansas River, Great Bend and vicinity, Kansas	H. 182, 89th Cong	$4,030,000
Arkansas River, Las Animas, Colo	H. 165, 89th Cong	1,541,000
Bayou Bodcau, Ark. and La	H. 203, 89th Cong	1,524,000
Big Creek, Hays, Kans	S. 22, 89th Cong	2,702,000
Big Sandy River and tributaries, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia.	H. 246, 89th Cong	51,491,000
Big Sioux River, Iowa and S. Dak	H. 199, 88th Cong	6,400,000
Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak.	{H. 579, 87th Cong {H. 193, 88th Cong	} 3,885,000
Biscayne, Bay, Fla	H. 213, 89th Cong	1,954,000
Hendry County, central and southern Florida	H. 102, 88th Cong	(4,986,000)
Southwest Dade County, central and southern Florida	S. 20, 89th Cong	(4,903,000)
Caddo Dam, La	S. 39, 89th Cong	1,934,000
Chagrin River, Ohio	S. 35, 89th Cong	2,200,000
Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers, Iowa and Mo	H. 238, 89th Cong	9,167,000
Chartiers Creek, Pa	H. 302, 88th Cong	12,207,000
Cheat River, W. Va	H. 243, 89th Cong	133,548,000
Crutcho Creek, Okla	S. 47, 89th Cong	1,801,000
Des Moines, Iowa	Modification of existing project	
East Rockaway Inlet, N.Y	H. 215, 89th Cong	32,620,000
East St. Louis, Ill	H. 329, 88th Cong	6,180,000
Eel River, Calif	H. 234, 89th Cong	13,732,000
El Paso, Tex	H. 207, 89th Cong	12,493,000
Elizabeth River, N.J	H. 249, 89th Cong	9,769,000
Fishing River, Mo	H. 281, 89th Cong	7,260,000
Flint River, Ga	H. 567, 87th Cong	88,653,000
Gila River at Phoenix, Ariz	H. 216, 89th Cong	58,310,000
Gila River-Indian Bend Wash, Ariz	H. 303, 88th Cong	7,250,000
Gila River-Santa Rosa Wash, Ariz	H. 189, 89th Cong	6,430,000
Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana	H. 184, 89th Cong	5,500,000
Grand River at Grandville, Mich	H. 157, 88th Cong	1,373,000
Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa	H. 241, 89th Cong	218,009,000
Grande Ronde River, Oreg	H. 280, 89th Cong	20,440,000
Highland Bayou, Tex	H. 168, 89th Cong	3,500,000
Hocking River Basin, Ohio	H. 287, 89th Cong	4,520,000
Housatonic River, Conn., N.Y., and Mass	H. 324, 88th Cong	5,100,000
Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa	H. 166, 89th Cong	17,570,000
James River, N.Dak	H. 266, 89th Cong	3,083,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	S. 28, 89th Cong	706,000
John Martin Reservoir, Colo	Modification of existing project	
John Redmond Reservoir, Grand River, Kans	S. 27, 89th Cong	730,000
Kaskaskia River levees, Illinois	H. 351, 88th Cong	3,498,000
Lake Pontchartrain, La	H. 231, 89th Cong	56,235,000
Lee Creek, Ark. and Okla	H. 270, 89th Cong	10,000,000
Little Colorado River, Winslow, Ariz	S. 63, 88th Cong	2,775,000
Little Nemaha River, Nebr	H. 160, 89th Cong	1,524,000
Little Rock levees, Arkansas	S. 55, 89th Cong	363,000
Lytle and Warm Creeks, Calif	S. 53, 89th Cong	9,750,000
Martins Fork Reservoir, Ky	H. 244, 89th Cong	4,860,000
Mississippi River and tributaries	H. 308, 88th Cong	181,109,000
Morgan City and vicinity, Louisiana	H. 167, 89th Cong	3,049,000
Napa River, Calif	H. 222, 89th Cong	14,950,000
Neuse River Basin, N.C	H. 175, 89th Cong	18,600,000
New Bern, N.C	H. 183, 89th Cong	10,400,000
Ocracoke Island, N.C	H. 109, 89th Cong	1,636,000
Ouachita River and tributaries, Monroe, La	H. 328, 88th Cong	520,000
Pat Mayse Reservoir, Tex	Modification of existing project	310,000
Phillippi Creek, Fla	H. 156, 89th Cong	4,592,000
Pine Bluff sewer outfall, Arkansas	Modification of existing project	[2]
Platte River, Mo. and Iowa	H. 262, 89th Cong	26,889,000
Rahway River, N.J	H. 67, 89th Cong	1,514,000
Roseau River, Minn	H. 282, 89th Cong	2,550,000
San Diego River, Calif	H. 212, 89th Cong	14,600,000
Sandy Lick Creek, Pa	H. 185, 89th Cong	1,654,000
Sawmill River and tributaries, New York	H. 258, 89th Cong	1,924,000
Scotts Creek, Calif	H. 259, 89th Cong	9,360,000
Shidler Reservoir-Salt Creek, Okla	H. 242, 89th Cong	6,150,000
Skunk River, Iowa	H. 267, 89th Cong	12,893,000
Sonoma Creek, Calif	H. 224, 89th Cong	9,400,000
St. Francis River Drainage District 7, Ark	S. 57, 89th Cong	1,372,000
St. John River (Dickey and Lincoln School), Maine	H. 236, 89th Cong	227,000,000
Staten Island, N.Y	H. 181, 89th Cong	6,230,000
Stratford, Conn	H. 292, 88th Cong	4,340,000
Sun River at Great Falls, Mont	Modification of existing project	
Tahquitz Creek-White Water River, Calif	H. 223, 89th Cong	3,442,000
Taylors Bayou, Tex	H. 206, 89th Cong	5,004,000
Trinidad Dam, Colo	Modification of existing project	
Wabash River and tributaries, Illinois and Indiana, No. 1.	S. 29, 89th Cong	44,800,000
Wabash River and tributaries, Illinois and Indiana, No. 2.	H. 202, 89th Cong	72,900,000

[1] Amounts in parenthesis not included in total.
[2] To be determined.

Flood control projects—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal cost of new work [1]
Walnut River and tributaries, Kansas	H. 232, 89th Cong	$66,036,000
Waurika, Okla	S. 33, 88th Cong	418,000
Westerly, R.I	H. 85, 89th Cong	3,287,000
White Oak Bayou, Tex	H. 169, 89th Cong	1,800,000
Willow Creek, Oreg	H. 233, 89th Cong	6,680,000
Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Ill	H. 150, 88th Cong	179,000
Yuba River-Bullards Bar, Calif	H. 180, 89th Cong	8,979,000
Zumbro River, Minn	H. 246, 88th Cong	975,000
Total, 88 projects		1,622,159,000

Arkansas River and Tributaries at Great Bend, Kans.

(H. Doc. 182, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Great Bend, the county seat of Barton County, is located on the left bank of the Arkansas River at river mile 873 about 228 miles downstream from the Colorado-Kansas State line. The city is bordered on the north and east by the Walnut Creek watershed and on the south by the Arkansas River.

Authority.—Resolutions of the House Flood Control Committee adopted July 2, 1943, and January 21, 1944.

Existing project.—There is no Federal flood control project at Great Bend. Local interests in cooperation with the works progress administration constructed some flood protection works on the Arkansas River and Little Walnut Creek.

Flood problem.—Aggradation from sediment deposit has reduced the channel capacities to 4,000 cubic feet per second on the Arkansas River and 2,100 cubic feet per second on Walnut Creek. The maximum flood of record on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, which was partially controlled by John Martin Dam, had a peak discharge at Great Bend of 20,200 cubic feet per second. A recurrence of a discharge of this magnitude under existing conditions would cause damages estimated at $1,770,000. The maximum flood of record on Walnut Creek had a discharge of 12,700 cubic feet per second near Albert, about 14 miles northwest of the city. A recurrence of this flood would cause damages estimated at $2,345,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of 6.2 miles of leveed channel to divert Walnut Creek floodflows around Great Bend into the Arkansas River at a point southwest of and upstream from the city; a leveed channel 1.5 miles long to direct Little Walnut Creek floodflows into the Walnut diversion channel; 6 miles of improved channel with levees along the Arkansas River; and a tieback levee 4.3 miles long on the left bank of the river upstream from the entrance of the Walnut diversion channel; and appurtenant works.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1963)

Federal	$4,030,000
Non-Federal	1,810,000
Total	5,840,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$127,600	$57,280	$184,880
Maintenance and operation	0	29,820	29,820
Total	127,600	87,100	214,700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented	----------	----------	826,800
Land enhancement	----------	----------	16,400
Total	----------	----------	843,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.9.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project, including easements required for flood-zoning purposes in the ponding areas; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and free from claims as a result of flooding from residual interior runoff during operation of the project; prohibit any encroachment on the design capacities of the river channel, diversion channels, interior drains, and ponding areas; and if the ponding area capacities are impaired, provide promptly, without cost to the United States, substitute storage or equivalent pumping capacity; inform periodically all concerned, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army, that some flooding will continue to occur because of temporary ponding; make any alterations to existing improvements, other than railroad bridges and approaches connected therewith; provide fences on both sides of the Walnut diversion channel for structural protection and as a safety measure during periods of high flow; and maintain and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Public Health Service: Favorable.

State of Kansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee recognizes that the city of Great Bend is in need of flood protection, and considers the recommended project a sound and well justified solution to the serious flood problem.

Arkansas River, Las Animas, Colo.

(H. Doc. 165, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Las Animas is located on the south bank of the Arkansas River in southeastern Colorado about 75 miles upstream from the Colorado-Kansas State line.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Senate Commerce Committee adopted September 30, 1942, and the House Flood Control Committee adopted July 2, 1943.

Existing project.—There is no existing flood control project at Las Animas. The Pueblo Reservoir authorized for construction by the

Bureau of Reclamation as an element of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project is located about 117 miles upstream from Las Animas and it will reduce floodflows materially.

Flood problem.—Sediment deposited in the river channel has gradually reduced the capacity so that overbank flow now occurs at about 6,500 cubic feet per second and urban flooding occurs at 10,000 cubic feet per second. The maximum flood of record with a peak flow of 187,000 cubic feet per second would cause more than $3 million in damages which would be reduced to about $2.5 million with Pueblo Reservoir constructed.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a levee about 9.6 miles long on the right bank of the Arkansas River beginning about 5½ miles upstream from the city of Las Animas and extending downstream to the mouth of the Purgatoire River, a left bank levee extending about 1 mile upstream from the junction of Colorado State Highway 194 and U.S. Highway 50, protective measures for the levees, and interior drainage works.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963)

Federal	$1,541,000
Non-Federal	184,000
Total	1,725,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$48,800	$5,800	$54,600
Maintenance and operation		4,400	4,400
Total	48,800	10,200	59,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			70,500
Increased land utilization			3,900
Total			74,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, including easements required for flood-zoning purposes in the ponding areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; at least annually inform individuals concerned about the residual flood problem involved owing to temporary ponding; prevent encroachment on the river channel, which would reduce the design flow capacity through the leveed section and on the ponding areas and interior drains; and, if ponding area capacity is impaired, provide substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity promptly without cost to the United States; make any alterations to existing improvements, other than railroad bridges and approaches in connection therewith; and maintain and operate the works after completion, including the overbank clearing under and between the new highway bridge and the existing railroad bridge. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Colorado: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that Las Animas has a long history of floods, and the problem of reduced channel capacity from sediment deposition continues to increase the flood damage potential. It believes the project is soundly conceived and its operation well coordinated with other water resource developments in the area.

Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, Bayou Bodcau, and Red Chute, Loggy, Black, and Cypress Bayous, Ark. and La.

(H. Doc. 203, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Bayou Bodcau drains 1,150 square miles in southwestern Arkansas and northwestern Louisiana. It rises in the vicinity of Hope, Ark., flows southerly through Bayou Bodcau Reservoir and Bodcau Lake to join Cypress Bayou and form Red Chute Bayou. The flow continues through Red Chute Bayou, Flat River, and Loggy Bayou, and enters Red River from the left bank about 40 miles below Shreveport, La.

Authority.—Two resolutions of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, adopted June 13, 1956, and May 23, 1957, concerning the advisability of improvements for flood control and related purposes.

Existing project.—Federal flood control projects in the area include: The existing project "Red River below Denison Dam, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La.," which provides for construction of upstream reservoirs in combination with existing or authorized Federal and non-Federal levee improvements, channel stabilization, and incorporation of existing projects. Two of the six initially authorized reservoirs, Texarkana and Ferrells Bridge, are now in operation, and the levee and bank stabilization feature below Fulton, Ark., is 87 percent complete. The Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, which contains no permanent pool, is complete for flood control; the Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou, Louisiana, project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, which provides for channel improvement of Loggy Bayou, Flat River, and Red Chute Bayou, has been completed. The State of Louisiana participated in the improvement.

Flood problems.—Since 1940, five floods have cause major damages in the basin. Flooding is caused by headwater overflow from Bayou Bodcau, Cypress Bayou, Black Bayou, Flat River, Red Chute Bayou, and their tributaries, and to a lesser extent by backwater from Red River entering the area through Loggy Bayou. The average annual flood damages are estimated at $85,000 under present conditions and $59,000 under ultimate conditions with the authorized upstream reservoirs on tributaries of Red River in operation.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Extension of the existing levee along Cypress Bayou, generally in a southerly direction to the junction of Cross Bayou and Red Chute Bayou and thence parallel to the west bank of Red Chute for a distance of 9.5 miles with channel clearing and snagging on Red Chute Bayou between miles 11 and 20.2 above the mouth; construction of the Flat River-Loggy Bayou levee which would extend about 32.1 miles from the lower end of the existing Red River

levee in the vicinity of Ninock, La., along the high bank of Red River to a point on the right descending bank of Loggy Bayou, approximately 1 mile above its mouth, thence along the right banks of Loggy Bayou, Flat River, Red Chute, and Cutoff Bayous, and tie into the existing Red River levee near Taylortown, La.; and enlargement of 11.6 miles of the Flat River channel from Cutoff Bayou to Cooper Bayou. Landside drainage, sump areas, drainage structures, relocation of pipelines and utilities, and modification of bridges would be required in connection with the work.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1961)

Federal	$1,524,000
Non-Federal	907,000
Total	2,431,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$48,700	$55,200	$103,900
Maintenance and operation		24,100	24,100
Total	48,700	79,300	128,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			53,400
Increased land use			180,600
Total			234,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, rights-of-way; relocations and alterations of utilities; hold and save; prevent encroachments on channels and ponding areas; maintain and operate; accomplish associated drainage works. Local interests have indicated their willingness to comply.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Generally favorable.

State of Arkansas: Favorable.

State of Louisiana: Generally favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee believes the proposed improvement will provide urgently needed flood protection for a large agricultural area, improve drainage conditions, and decrease the time of flooding due to the larger floods. Also, it has been noted that the project will permit the conversion of cleared land to higher agricultural use and the conversion of woodland to agricultural use.

Big Creek at Hays, Kans.

(S. Doc. 22, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Big Creek is a left-bank tributary of Smoky Hill River in west-central Kansas. Hays, county seat of Ellis County, has a population of about 12,000.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted May 29, 1951.

Existing project.—While there are no existing Federal improvements in the Big Creek Basin, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is currently preparing a feasibility report on the Ellis irrigation unit, which includes a multiple-purpose reservoir at the Round Mound site about 17 miles upstream from Hays.

Flood problem.—Flooding at Hays is caused by overflows from Big Creek, Lincoln Draw, and Chetolah Creek. Although the frequency and maximum severity of Big Creek floods at Hays would be reduced by the potential Round Mound Reservoir, a recurrence of the 1951 flood would be largely unaffected, since the storm which generated that flood was centered below the damsite. Average annual flood damages, under existing conditions, are estimated at about $265,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan consists of channel improvements and levees along Big Creek, a diversion channel and levee on Lincoln Draw, and a detention structure, channel improvements, and levees on Chetolah Creek

Estimated cost (price level of 1963)

Federal	$2,702,000
Non-Federal	1,009,000
Total	3,711,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$85,600	$33,200	$118,800
Maintenance and operation	0	7,900	7,900
Total	85,600	41,100	126,700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			243,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.9.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, etc.; hold and save the United States from damages; perform necessary alterations and relocations of utilities and structures; maintain and operate the project; prevent encroachments on improved channels; keep local people informed of project effects. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Kansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee is aware of necessity for flood protection to the city of Hays. This project is well justified.

Big Sandy River and Tributaries, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia

(H. Doc. 246, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Big Sandy River Basin is located in eastern Kentucky, western West Virginia, and the northern tip of Virginia. Big Sandy River, formed by the junction of Tug and Levisa Forks at Louisa, Ky., flows northerly about 27 miles, and enters the Ohio River about 10 miles downstream from Huntington.

Authority.—Partial response to resolutions adopted April 21, 1954, and March 19, 1963, by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and adopted June 19, 1963, by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives.

Existing project.—One reservoir project (Dewey Reservoir) and two local protection projects (Prestonburg, Ky., and Williamson, W. Va.) have been completed. The Dewey Reservoir is located on Johns Creek. The Prestonburg, Ky., local backwater protection project was completed in 1959 at a cost of $371,000 and consists of a levee and a pumping station for protection of Prestonburg from Levisa Fork backwater floods. The Williamson, W. Va., local protection project was completed in 1963 at a cost of about $1,060,000 and consists of a floodwall with gate openings and a pump station and will provide protection for the main part of Williamson against floods equal to the major flood of record. Projects presently under construction are the Fishtrap, the John W. Flannagan, and the North Fork of Pound Reservoir projects. One reservoir (Haysi Reservoir project) is authorized by the 1938 Flood Control Act as a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control in the Ohio River Basin. Stream snagging and clearing projects to alleviate flooding at Langley and in the Wayland through Garrett area on the Right Fork of Beaver Creek in Floyd County, Ky., and at Meta on Johns Creek at Pike County, Ky., have been found to be feasible for construction under authority of section 2 of the Flood Control Act of 1937, as amended.

Flood problem.—The Big Sandy River Basin is subject to frequent and destructive flooding. Major floods usually occur during the winter and early spring months. The flood of 1957 resulted in damages amounting to $32,707,000 on Levisa Fork and $6,085,000 on Tug Fork. The damages from the March 1963 flood were estimated to be $19,951,000 in the Big Sandy River Basin, with $17,761,000 being on Levisa Fork and $2,190,000 on Tug Fork.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The recommended plan of improvement provides for construction of the Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Dam and Reservoir projects and construction of a channel improvement project on Beaver Creek for protection of Martin, Ky.

Estimated cost (price level of 1964)

	Reservoirs			Local protection, Martin, Ky.	Total
	Yatesville	Paintsville	Panther Creek		
Federal	$20,077,000	$16,974,000	$11,094,000	$3,346,000	$51,491,000
Non-Federal	[1] (2,600,000)	[1] (965,000)	[1] (503,000)	110,000	110,000
Total	20,077,000	16,974,000	11,094,000	3,456,000	51,601,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to reimburse the United States for ½ the separable costs of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Project economics

	Reservoirs			Local protection, Martin, Ky.	Total
	Yatesville	Paintsville	Panther Creek		
Annual charges:					
Federal:					
Interest and amortization	$563,000	$543,000	$360,300	$133,600	$1,599,900
Maintenance	57,500	57,200	56,900	0	171,600
Total Federal	620,500	600,200	417,200	133,600	1,771,500
Non-Federal:					
Interest and amortization	84,300	32,990	17,100	4,500	138,800
Maintenance	262,000	107,200	55,200	20,000	444,400
Land productivity	35,700	22,000	2,300		60,000
Total non-Federal	382,000	162,100	74,600	24,500	643,200
Total charges	1,002,500	762,300	491,800	158,100	2,414,700
Annual benefits:					
Flood control	283,500	159,800	133,200	159,400	735,900
Recreation	1,272,000	523,000	279,100		2,074,100
Water quality	210,000	357,000	105,000		672,000
Total	1,765,500	1,039,800	517,300	159,400	3,482,000
Benefit-cost ratio	1.8	1.4	1.1	1.01	1.4

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction of the Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Dam and Reservoir projects local interests will be required to give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that for each major project they will in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees), with interest, one-half of the separable first cost of the reservoir projects allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amounts involved being currently estimated as follows:

Reservoir	Total amount	Initial amount	Future amount
Yatesville	$2,600,000	$1,024,000	$1,576,000
Paintsville	965,000	725,000	240,000
Panther Creek	503,500	387,000	116,500
Total	4,068,500	2,136,000	1,932,500

Bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amounts involved being currently estimated as follows on an average annual basis:

Reservoir	Total amount [1]	Initial amount [1]	Future amount [2]
Yatesville	$262,000	$125,000	$212,000
Paintsville	107,000	88,000	29,000
Panther Creek	55,000	45,000	15,500
Total	424,000	258,000	256,500

[1] Values are on average annual basis distributed over the economic life of the project.
[2] Not discounted.

Provided further, that the sizing and responsibility for development, operation, maintenance, and replacement of the recreation and fish and wild life enhancement features of the reservoirs may be modified in accordance with the alternatives provided in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, depending upon the intentions of local interests regarding participation in the costs of these features at the time of reservoir construction and subsequent thereto, and that appropriate adjustments reflecting such modifications may be made in the allocation of costs to other project purposes; and provided further that the local participation in the recreation and fish and wildlife features may be modified to conform with standards established by studies made pursuant to programs pertaining to Appalachia; hold and save the United States free from damages resulting from water-rights claims due to construction and operation of the project; exercise to the full extent of their legal capability, control against removal of streamflow made available for water quality control; contribute to the control of pollution of streams subject to low-flow augmentation by adequate treatment or other methods of controlling wastes at their source; and protect channels downstream from the reservoirs from encroachment which would adversely affect operation of the reservoir system; prior to construction of the channel improvement project on Beaver Creek for the protection of Martin, Ky., local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, spoil-disposal areas, and rights-of-way required for construction and operation of these works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction work; perform without cost to the United States all necessary utility relocations and alterations, highway or highway bridge construction, and other alterations required in connection with these works; prevent encroachments on the improved channel which might interfere with the proper functioning of the project; maintain the improved channel in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and at least annually inform interests affected that the channel improvement will not provide complete protection against a flood greater than that which occurred in January 1946.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

Commonwealth of Kentucky: Favorable.
State of West Virginia: Favorable.
Commonwealth of Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress, but expects that after authorization, a reanalysis of the benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary, to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, would be made prior to the initiation of construction.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended projects will provide a substantial degree of flood protection in the basin in addition to increasing available water supplies for municipal and industrial use. The reservoirs would be attractive lakes for outdoor recreation. Construction of the projects would provide employment in the Big Sandy River Basin where economic redevelopment is needed.

The committee considers it appropriate that prior to initiation of construction the Department of the Army prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to conform to the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

Big Sioux River, Iowa and South Dakota

(H. Doc. 199, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The Big Sioux River rises in northeastern South Dakota and flows generally south to join the Missouri River just above Sioux City, Iowa.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Public Works Committee adopted July 29, 1955.

Existing project.—There is a Federal flood control project in the basin providing for channel improvement, levees, and a diversion channel at the city of Sioux Falls. Also, there is an authorized but unconstructed harbor project at the mouth of the river at Sioux City, Iowa.

Flood problem.—Floods generate from snowmelt in the spring and from heavy rainfalls in early and late summer. The channel of the lower Big Sioux River is tortuous and winding and its capacity is small causing frequent flooding of agricultural lands and improvements in the area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Consists of enlargement, cleanout, and channel cutoffs on the Big Sioux River from its mouth to about 2 miles north of Akron, Iowa. Minor alterations to one highway bridge and two short sections of gravel road would be required.

Estimated cost (October 1963 prices)

Federal	$6,400,000
Non-Federal	384,000
Total	6,784,000

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$265,500
Maintenance and operation	20,000
Total	285,500
Annual benefits: Damages prevented	324,600

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; all necessary alterations and relocations; maintain and operate the project; hold the United States free from damages; provide lands required for fish and wildlife mitigation measures; develop, manage, and maintain fish and wildlife facilities and habitat areas; keep local interests advised of flood protection effectiveness of the improvement. Local interests have indicated a willingness to comply.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of South Dakota: Favorable.

State of Iowa: Does not concur in fish and wildlife mitigation plan. Have expressed the view that the report should be delayed pending results of authorized study of upstream reservoirs. It is the view of the Chief of Engineers that the proposed project will be compatible with, and enhanced by, any future flood control plan that might be developed for the upper basin, and will not become redundant as a result of any upstream reservoirs that may later be authorized and built. It is his further view that this proposed project will not bar consideration of other projects which may be developed in the basin in the future. He therefore recommends authorization of the project without further delay. If the project is authorized, the corps will continue coordination with concerned interests during advanced planning with a view to developing a mutually agreeable fish and wildlife mitigation plan.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the State of Iowa has not concurred in the plan, and that controversy is apparent pertaining to the conservation and mitigation of fish and wildlife values. The committee also is aware that some interests prefer further consideration of upstream reservoirs prior to the development of the channel. Accordingly, the committee believes it advisable the project be authorized subject to the provision that it be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

Big Stone Lake, Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak.

(H. Doc. 579, 87th Cong. and H. Doc. 193, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Big Stone Lake is located on the Minnesota-South Dakota State line at the head of the Minnesota River. Whetstone River is a tributary of the Minnesota River. The confluence of Whetstone River with the Minnesota River is immediately below Big Stone Lake.

Authority.—Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936.

Existing project.—There are no existing Federal projects in the immediate project area. Non-Federal project consists of an outlet control dam at Big Stone Lake, a diversion of Whetstone River into Big Stone Lake, a silt barrier at the diversion, and channel improvement immediately below Big Stone Lake.

Flood problem.—(1) Local interests never acquired flowage rights on Big Stone Lake, as a result the project has failed to solve the flood

problems; (2) diversion of Whetstone River has resulted in excessive stages on Big Stone Lake; (3) releases of flood waters from Big Stone Lake for long periods has resulted in flood problems to downstream agricultural interests; (4) silt deposition resulting from the diversion of Whetstone River has resulted in loss of lake area; and (5) the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Fish and Wildlife Service, finds that this area would be an unparalleled strategic location for a national wildlife refuge which would be of high value for development of waterfowl resources; and that it would be of national significance in that Bureau's migratory bird management program.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a dam, reservoir, and appurtenant works on Minnesota River above U.S. Highway No. 75, including improvements of about 2.5 miles of drainage ditch and acquisition of about 1,600 acres of additional lands bordering the reservoir specifically for wildlife conservation and development; modification of the outlet control dam, Big Stone Lake, by lowering the crest 3 feet and providing 6 feet of stop-log control; modification of the silt barrier, Big Stone Lake, by raising the crest 1 foot; bank stabilization and related work in the lower 6-mile reach of Whetstone River; and channel improvement on Minnesota River for about 3 miles below the lake outlet control dam.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1959)

Federal	$3, 885, 000
Non-Federal	118, 000
Total	4, 003, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$141, 600	$4, 200	$145, 800
Maintenance and operation	2, 000	3, 000	5, 000
Interest on productive land	15, 900		15, 900
Total	159, 500	7, 200	166, 700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			19, 100
Recreation			32, 000
Fish and wildlife			137, 900
Total			189, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—For the project as a whole: Contribute in cash 20 percent of the cost allocated to flood control, such contribution being presently estimated at $102,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to commencement of construction, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final allocation of cost to be made after the actual costs have been determined; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works. For the project, exclusive of the dam and reservoir: Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; maintain and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make at their own expense all necessary changes to highways, highway bridges and approaches, utilities, and

miscellaneous existing improvements; and prevent encroachments which would reduce the flood-carrying capacity of the improved channel; provided further that, prior to commencement of construction of the dam and reservoir above U.S. Highway No. 75, the Chief of Engineers and the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, shall prepare a general plan, mutually acceptable to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior, for administering the use of waters, land, or interests therein for wildlife conservation and development so as to provide the best use for all project purposes; and provided further, the upstream work not be undertaken until construction has been started on the dam and reservoir above U.S. Highway No. 75. Local interests are willing to furnish the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Minnesota: Favorable.
State of South Dakota: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget (Printed in H. Doc. 193/88/2).—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of the report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that this area requires further flood protection and in addition would be an unparalleled strategic location for a national wildlife refuge which would be of high value for development of waterfowl resources, and that it would be of national significance in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife migratory bird management program. The project is economically justified.

Biscayne Bay, Fla.

(H. Doc. 213, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Biscayne Bay is located in the extreme southeastern part of Florida in Dade County. It extends southward about 28 miles from the north Dade County line southward, including Miami and Miami Beach areas to Cutler and Cape Florida.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—No hurricane project.

Flood problem.—All of the shore areas of Biscayne Bay are subject to storm-tidal flooding and wave damages. Within the study area there are about 15,000 acres at and below the 7-foot level and about 20,000 acres at and below the 10-foot level. These areas are occupied for the most part by residences, apartments, motels, and hotels with a permanent population of about 220,000 in 1960. Indications are that land usage within these vulnerable areas will increase about 60 percent within 50 years. Historical records indicate that since 1830 about 194 tropical storms have threatened the Biscayne Bay area. However, detailed information on the effects of storms on the area is available only since 1925. Since that date, 14 hurricanes have affected the area, including 4 causing catastrophic effects. The most intense of these occurred in September 1926 when over 100 lives were lost. Total damages were estimated at the time at $76 million, of which about $40 million were from inundation and wave damage. Total

inundation and wave losses since 1925 are estimated at about $70 million.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a stone- and asphalt-armored earthfill barrier connected to the mainland about 1 mile north of the Rickenbacker Causeway and extending eastward to Fishermans Channel adjacent to Fisher Island, a distance of about 3 miles. The structure would have an ungated opening for shallow-draft navigation at its intersection with the Intracoastal Waterway.

Estimated cost (price level, 1962)

Federal	$1,954,000
Non-Federal	837,000
Total	2,791,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$74,100	$31,800	$105,900
Maintenance and operation	0	7,600	7,600
Total	74,100	39,400	113,500
Annual benefits: Damages prevented (total)			2,150,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—19.0.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction and maintenance of the project at costs presently estimated at $181,000; bear 30 percent of the total first cost of the project, a sum presently estimated at $837,000 to consist of the cost of all lands, easements and rights-of-way, and a cash contribution presently estimated at $656,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, with the final apportionment of costs to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and maintain and operate the project works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. Local interests have indicated that they are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: No objection.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The Miami area is vulnerable to damaging hurricanes that threaten human life and property. The committee notes the benefit-cost ratio of 19 and recommends authorization of hurricane protection.

Central and Southern Florida Project, Hendry County West of Levees 1, 2, and 3

(H. Doc. 102, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The area of Hendry County in this report is located in the south-central portion of the Florida Peninsula 10 miles southwest of Lake Okeechobe.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 9, 1960 (partial response).

Existing project.—The Federal project for the area was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 and provided for canals, levees, and water control structures on the west and outside of the Everglades agricultural and conservation areas of the central and southern Florida flood control project. No work has been started on the Hendry County authorization. Levees and canals of the existing project forming the eastern border are completed.

Problem.—The flatlands of Hendry County in this area are flooded frequently because of poor drainage and prolonged rainfall. During recent years, notable major floods occurred in 1947, 1948, 1953, and 1960. A major flood such as that of 1947 covers nearly all of the 261-square-mile area. Most of the damage is to the agricultural lands immediately west of the levees of the existing project.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan provides that the existing project for central and southern Florida be modified and extended with respect to the authorized improvement on the west side of the Everglades agricultural and conservation areas in Hendry County, Fla., to provide the primary works for flood control and major drainage.

Estimated cost (price level of February 1962)

Federal	$4,986,000
Non-Federal	[1] 1,567,000
Total	6,553,000

[1] Includes a cash contribution of 19.5 percent of contract price plus supervision and administration thereof.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$181,000	$109,000	$290,000
Maintenance and operation		71,000	71,000
Economic loss of productivity on lands		3,000	3,000
Total	181,000	183,000	364,000
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented			515,000
Increased land use			350,000
Total			865,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.4.

Local cooperation.—Local interests are required to contribute 19.5 percent of contract price plus supervision and administration, presently estimated at $1,159,000, to be paid prior to start of pertinent work units; construct and maintain associated lateral drainage facilities; provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; make all bridge, road and utility relocations; hold and save the United States free

from damage; prevent encroachment on the channel; and maintain and operate the completed works.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the work recommended is a necessary modification of a system of protective levees, canals, and water control structures which was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, in an area where no work was initiated. The plan as modified will adequately serve the present needs of the area and is recommended for authorization.

Central and Southern Florida Project, Southwest Dade County, Fla.

(S. Doc. 20, 89th Cong.)

Location.—In central and southern Florida, southwest Dade County includes lands south of Tamiami Trail, west of levee 31, and east of the easterly boundary of Everglades National Park in Dade County, Fla.

Authority.—Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate on June 6, 1958.

Existing project.—Federal projects include: (*a*) Levee 29 forms the south boundary of conservation areas Nos. 3–A and 3–B and is the northern boundary of southwest Dade County area; (*b*) structure 12 in levee 29 releases floodwater from area 3–A into Everglades National Park just west of southwest Dade County area; (*c*) levee 67 extension is an authorized levee that will extend 8 miles along west boundary of southwest Dade County; and (*d*) levee 31(N) was authorized in 1948 and 10.8 miles have been completed along eastern edge of southwest Dade County area.

Flood problem.—Practically the entire area of 193 square miles is subject to flooding every year and lower lands are flooded throughout wet years. About 3,000 acres in the area are used on a seasonal basis for vegetable growing. Flood damage to present land use is estimated at $50,000 annually.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification and extension of existing project for central and southern Florida to provide:

Primary works: Canal and levee improvements, control structures, and pumping stations to provide outlets to serve existing and proposed associated drainage works by removal of the water ponded in the area during the wet season prior to planting time and limit ponding during a 1-in-10-year storm in the dry season to a few days.

Associated works: About 50 miles of secondary canals, small lateral canals, and tertiary works.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1963)

Federal	$4,903,000
Non-Federal	4,125,000
Total	9,028,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$189,100	$177,200	$366,300
Maintenance and operation	0	206,200	206,200
Economic loss on land	0	8,600	8,600
Associated works	0	98,300	98,300
Total	189,100	490,300	679,400
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			260,700
Increased land use			2,464,300
Total			2,725,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.0.

Local cooperation.—Local interests are required to contribute 46 percent of the sum of the contract price and the costs of supervision and administration and provide as their share of the initial costs of the primary improvements all needed lands and rights-of-way, including construction of new highway bridges, road changes, and alterations to miscellaneous utilities and other existing improvements; to hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; prohibit encroachment on the flood-carrying capacities of the improved channels; maintain and operate the improvements after completion; and construct and maintain the associated drainage works needed to realize the benefits made available by the proposed primary improvements. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The land is extremely low and practically the entire area is flooded every year while the lower areas are flooded throughout wet years. The committee considers that modification and extension of the existing project for central and southern Florida is desirable to make this highly productive area available to agriculture displaced from coastal areas by urban expansion.

Caddo Dam, La.

(S. Doc. 39, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Caddo Dam is located in Caddo Parish about 19 miles northwest of Shreveport in northwestern Louisiana and the reservoir extends upstream on Cypress Creek into Texas.

Authority.—Resolution of Senate Committee on Public Works, adopted January 2, 1962.

Existing project.—The existing project, "Cypress Bayou and Waterway from Jefferson, Tex., to Shreveport, La.," provides for dredging and straightening the channel, removing obstructions, and clearing the banks of Twelve Mile Bayou from the Red River at Shreveport, La., to Jefferson, Tex., a distance of about 66 miles; and the construc-

tion of a dam without lock at the foot of Caddo Lake. All work has been completed. The existing dam consists of approximately 3,485 feet of concrete wall supported on piling which has a crest elevation of 170.5 feet.

Problem.—The existing dam, now 50 years old, is in very poor condition. About 600 feet of the spillway section is moving downstream and only the resistance of the riprap is preventing complete failure. The rate of movement at the maximum point is about 1 inch per year. The dam has reached a stage of engineering distress so that it must either be removed so as not to constitute a hazard, or be rebuilt to maintain the status quo. If the dam should fail, or be removed, the degrading of the river would eventually cause the lake to drain and the resulting conditions would be worse from an economic standpoint than before the dam was built, since benefits from present uses of the lake would be lost or diminished. There is no legal obligation which would require perpetuating or replacing the existing structure by the Federal Government. However, in view of the history of the project, the present uses of the water, and the investments which have been made by local interests in reliance upon the continued existence of the lake, there would appear to be a moral obligation on the part of the Federal Government to replace the dam.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Replacement of the existing dam at the earliest practicable date with a new structure located about 200 feet downstream, having the same flow characteristics as the existing dam. The improvement would consist of a concrete L-type wall 2,400 feet long, about 1,200 linear feet of earth embankment; collection ditches and a discharge pond downstream of the concrete structure with a final stilling basin and outlet channel leading to Bayou Black.

Estimated cost (price level of 1964)

Federal	$1,934,000
Non-Federal	28,000
Total	1,962,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$79,000	$1,000	$80,000
Maintenance and operation	[1] 8,000		8,000
Total	87,000	1,000	88,000
Annual benefits:			
Navigation, maintenance and operation, oilfield			83,000
Water supply			90,000
Recreation			375,000
Commercial fishing			6,000
Preservation existing land values			427,000
Total			981,000

[1] Under the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army maintenance and operation would be a non-Federal cost.

Benefit-cost ratio.—11.1.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction and maintenance; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction and maintenance.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Louisiana: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget concurs in the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army set forth below, and advises that there is no objection to submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army recommends construction of a replacement dam at Federal expense, subject to willingness of local interests promptly to accept and assume ownership thereof, and all responsibility for subsequent operation and maintenance, and to the other conditions hereafter mentioned.

Under the above provision local interests would be responsible for furnishing all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; and holding and saving the United States free from damages due to construction.

The Secretary of the Army also recommends that the authorization include a provision for adequate public access and recreation development under the provisions of the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, the exact terms to be arranged within the range of flexibility provided by that act.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the existing Federal project constructed about 50 years ago to preserve an existing natural lake is in a hazardous condition. Although the lake is not presently used for the original project purpose, shallow draft commercial barge navigation, there is navigation use evaluated at $83,000 annually. Also, the lake is a vital source of municipal and industrial water supply and is used extensively for recreation. With further reference to recreation the committee notes that there are public roads leading to both ends of the dam, with public boat rentals available at these points. Also, there are in the order of 30 public access points around the lake.

The Secretary of the Army's recommendation that local interests accept ownership of and maintain and operate the project appears appropriate.

Chagrin River, Ohio

(S. Doc. 35, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Chagrin River is in northeastern Ohio and flows into Lake Erie about 15 miles east of Cleveland.

Authority.—Resolution by the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate adopted July 25, 1952.

Existing project.—There are no existing Federal flood control or navigation projects in the basin. In October 1960 residents of a flood area in the village of Willoughby Hills completed a local channel improvement consisting of straightening a short reach of existing channel and excavating a section of new channel across a meander. During the summer months, local interests have intermittently dredged a navigation channel through the sandbar at the mouth of the river. Generally, the effectiveness of the channel is lost in the next major orm.

Flood problem.—Most of the major floods in the basin have resulted from rain on snow-covered or frozen ground. In the lowermost

reaches of the river, flooding is aggravated by the sandbar in Lake Erie at the mouth of the river. The restrictive sandbar causes ice jams from river ice which, combined with windrowed lake ice, results in significantly higher stages and damages than would otherwise occur considering only the discharge. The maximum discharge of record, which occurred during the March 1948 flood, was estimated at 21,400 cubic feet per second, with a recurrence interval of about 35 years. Five lives were lost during the January 1959 flood which was the most damaging of record, with total damages estimated at $384,000 on the basis of May 1960 price levels.

Navigation problem.—The uncertainty as to entrance conditions is a deterrent to navigation and prevents realization of the full potential of the river mouth as a small-boat harbor.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of arrowhead breakwaters in Lake Erie at the mouth of Chagrin River, aggregating about 2,360 feet in length; realinement and enlargement of the Chagrin River channel from deep water in Lake Erie through the city of Eastlake, a total distance of about 10,400 feet, with a depth of 10 feet from deep water in Lake Erie to a point about 1,750 feet above the river mouth; thence a depth of 7 feet to a point about 3,500 feet above the river mouth; and thence uniform bottom slopes to the upstream limit of the improvement; levees, with a total length of about 7,000 feet, where required to supplement channel enlargement; a spur channel for navigation, 100 feet wide, 6 feet deep, and about 1,500 feet long; an access channel for navigation, 50 feet wide and 4 feet deep, from deep water to the secondary river channel; and recreational facilities at the river mouth.

The improvement for navigation and flood control may be undertaken independently of providing public recreational fishing facilities whenever funds are available and the required local cooperation has been furnished. The sizing and responsibility for development, maintenance, and replacement of these recreational fishing facilities may be modified in accordance with the alternatives provided in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, depending on the intentions of non-Federal interests regarding participation in the costs of these features at the time of construction and subsequent thereto.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1963)

Federal	$2,200,000
Non-Federal	755,000
Total	2,955,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$88,500	$30,500	$119,000
Maintenance and operation	7,500	10,500	18,000
Total	96,000	41,000	137,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			76,200
Enhancement			22,800
Recreational boating			103,000
Recreational fishing			103,000
Total			305,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.2.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of that portion of the first cost of Federal construction allocated to recreational navigation, such contribution presently estimated at $498,000 to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction and maintenance of the project including initial and subsequent spoil-disposal areas and any necessary retaining dikes and bulkheads, or the cost of such retaining works, and any subsequent redistribution of spoil material required; hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages incident to construction, operation, and maintenance of the project; provide without cost to the United States all alterations and relocations to existing improvements including highways, buildings, utilities, sewers, and other facilities which may be required because of the project; maintain and operate the project after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army except for Federal maintenance of aids to navigation; breakwaters; the entrance channel from deep water in Lake Erie to the shoreline, 275 to 220 feet wide, and about 1,000 feet long, to a depth of 10 feet; a part of the navigation channel from the shoreline upriver, 100 feet wide and about 3,100 feet long, to a depth of 10 feet for about 1,750 feet, thence a depth of 7 feet for about 1,350 feet; and a stub channel about 250 feet long beginning about 1,400 feet above the shoreline, generally 100 feet wide with widened approaches, to a depth of 10 feet; prescribe and enforce regulations to prevent obstruction or encroachment on channels and rights-of-way necessary to proper functioning of the project for flood control; prescribe and enforce speed limits to prevent damage by wave wash to the banks of project channels; establish a competent and properly constituted public body empowered to provide, maintain, and operate local harbor facilities, with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and service areas, including a public landing with suitable supply facilities, a launching ramp, parking areas, and access roads, open to all on equal terms; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable cost of the structural modifications necessary to provide for recreational fishing facilities on the breakwaters, and one-half of the cost of associated access facilities and parking areas with adequate sanitary facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated at $80,000; and bear all costs of maintenance and replacement of these modifications and associated facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated at $3,000 on an average annual basis.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Ohio: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the multiple-purpose plan will resolve the existing problems.

Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers, Iowa and Missouri

(H. Doc. 238, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers are left-bank tributaries of the Missouri River which together drain an area of 3,080 square miles in southern Iowa and north-central Missouri.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955.

Existing project.—Three sections of channel improvement along main stem of the Chariton completed in 1950 and 1952. A tieback levee at the mouth of the Chariton River is authorized by construction deferred for coordination with authorized Missouri River Agricultural levee system. The authorized Rathbun Reservoir on Chariton River in southern Iowa is in the preconstruction planning stage.

Problems.—Streams of the basin are subject to both floods and droughts. There are problems of floods, pollution, and inadequate low flows. The average annual flood damages along Mussel Fork and lower Shoal Creek in the Chariton River Basin and along the Little Chariton River and its tributaries are estimated at $370,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A reservoir on the East Fork of the Little Chariton at Long Branch site; a total of about 80 miles of channel improvements, mostly in the lower portion of the basin.

Estimated costs (price level of 1962)

LONG BEACH RESERVOIR

Federal	$5,280,000
Non-Federal	(1)
Total	5,280,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to repay an estimated $530,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife.

Channel improvements

	Mussel Fork	Little Chariton	Shoal Creek	Total
Federal	$1,267,000	$2,581,000	$39,000	$3,887,000
Non-Federal	219,000	598,000	5,000	822,000
Total	1,486,000	3,179,000	44,000	4,709,000

Total for program

Federal	$9,167,000
Non-Federal	822,000
Total	9,989,000

Project economics

LONG BEACH RESERVOIR

Annual charges	$203,600
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	75,200
Water supply	-------
Quality control	85,400
Recreation and fish and wildlife	91,800
Total	252,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Channel improvements

	Mussell Fork	Little Chariton	Shaol Creek	Total
Annual charges	$56,600	$109,600	$1,440	$167,640
Annual flood control benefits	83,400	167,100	3,900	254,400
Benefit-cost ratio	1.5	1.5	2.7	1.5

Local cooperation.—Bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with current policy, presently estimated at $530,000 and $3,000, respectively; provide the usual legal requirements of local cooperation in connection with the channel improvement work, including the provision to prevent encroachments on the improved channels that would impair their capacity.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Missouri: Favorable.
State of Iowa: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection. The Bureau of the Budget concurs in the action taken to delete Thomas Hill Reservoir from the recommended plan.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army noted that subsequent to submission of the report by the Chief of Engineers, on March 22, 1965, a supplemental review of the Thomas Hill Reservoir that is being constructed by local interests showed the reservoir does not conform to the project plan in the corps recommendation and that its authorization would pose difficulties in regard to reimbursement and cooperative arrangements as well as administrative and technical complications. Therefore, the Chief of Engineers now recommends against authorization of the Thomas Hill Reservoir as a Federal undertaking and the Secretary of the Army concurs in this recommendation. On this basis the total Federal construction cost of the recommended plan, including Long Branch Reservoir and the channel improvements, is estimated at $9,167,000.

Remarks.—The committee notes that local interests are constructing a reservoir for industrial water supply purposes at the Thomas Hill site. Accordingly, the Chief of Engineers does not recommend the Thomas Hill Reservoir as part of the plan of improvement for the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers. The committee believes this to be appropriate and accordingly recommends adoption of the remainder of the plan in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army.

Chartiers Creek Basin, Pa.

(H. Doc. 302, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Wholly within Washington and Allegheny Counties in southwestern Pennsylvania.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolutions, adopted September 10, 1956, and House Public Works Committee resolution, adopted July 31, 1957.

Existing project.—A Corps of Engineers project for channel improvement was completed recently on Chartiers Creek in the vicinity of Washington and the township of Canton. An approved project for channel improvement on Robinson Run at Oakdale, under Public Law 685, is inactive owing to the failure of local interests to meet the local cooperation requirements. The Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, is studying the possibility of providing small detention structures on headwater streams above Washington and above Oakdale.

Flood problem.—Flooding occurs all along Chartiers Creek, but the most severe flood damage occurs in two reaches: The Carnegie-Bridgeville reach, where flooding occurs on the average of once a year, and in the Canonsburg-Houston reach, where flooding occurs about three times in 2 years at Canonsburg and about three times per year at Houston. These areas contain many industrial firms, commercial buildings, residential areas, railroads, highways, utilities, and bridges.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Chartiers Creek, Pa., for flood control, by channel widening, deepening, and straightening, together with necessary railroad bridge changes and appurtenant works, in the Carnegie-Bridgeville and the Canonsburg-Houston reaches.

Estimated cost (price level of April 1962)

	Carnegie-Bridgeville reach	Canonsburg-Houston reach	Total
Federal	$9,320,000	$2,887,000	$12,207,000
Non-Federal	7,300,000	768,000	8,068,000
Total	16,620,000	3,655,000	20,275,000

Project economics (Carnegie-Bridgeville reach)

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$297,000	$316,000	$613,000
Maintenance and operation		39,000	39,000
Total	297,000	355,000	652,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			1,285,000
ARA			145,000
Total			1,430,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.5.

Project economics (Canonsburg-Houston reach)

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$90,900	$23,000	$113,900
Maintenance and operation		12,100	12,100
Total	90,900	35,100	126,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			191,100
ARA			29,000
Total			220,100

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project; accomplish all relocations and alterations of sewer, water, gas, oil, electric powerlines, and other utility alterations; railroad trackshifts; highway and street modifications; and construction of new, or reconstruction of existing, highway bridges made necessary by the construction work; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; establish channel limit lines within each county along the entire waterway downstream from the existing improvements at Washington, and conforming to the improvements recommended herein, and prevent any encroachment which would reduce the flood-carrying capacity of the channel so defined; at least annually notify interests affected that the project will not provide complete protection from floods greater in magnitude than that which occurred in September 1912; provided further, that improvement of either reach may be undertaken independently of the other whenever funds for that purpose are available and the prescribed local cooperation within the county has been provided. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Pennsylvania: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that severe and frequent flooding occurs all along Chartiers Creek. Extensive damages have been suffered by industrial and commercial facilities, railroads, and highways.

Cheat River, Rowlesburg Reservoir, W. Va.

(H. Doc. 243, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Cheat River, the second largest tributary of the Monongahela River, drains 1,424 square miles in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. The basin is oblong in shape, having an average length of approximately 102 miles and an average width of about 14 miles. The topography is generally rugged and characterized by bold parallel ridges separated by deep valleys. Topographic relief varies between elevation 778 mean sea level at the mouth of Cheat River and elevation 4,842 in the southern part of the basin.

Coal mining, leather processing, and textile manufacturing are the principal economic activities. A large steam-generated powerplant at Albright, W. Va., and a hydroelectric powerplant at Lake Lynn, Pa., on the Cheat River, are operated by subsidiaries of the Allegheny Power System. Population of the basin in 1960 was estimated at 52,000.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives adopted April 30, 1958, and June 3, 1959, respectively.

Existing project.—There are no Corps of Engineers improvements for flood control in the basin.

Flood problem.—Cheat River floods contribute to flood stages in both the Monongahela and Ohio Rivers. The towns of Rowlesburg, Manheim, and Albright, which are damaged by Cheat River floods, would be protected by the proposed reservoir. The major flood damages occur in the flood plains of the Monongahela and upper Ohio Rivers, where average annual damages are estimated at $2,404,000. Damages experienced along the entire Ohio River would be affected by a reservoir at Rowlesburg.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on the Cheat River above Rowlesburg, W. Va., for flood control, water quality control, recreation, and hydroelectric power production.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1963)

Federal	[1] $133, 548, 000
Non-Federal	[2]
Total	133, 548, 000

[1] Includes $51,291,000 for power facilities which are recommended for construction by either non-Federal interests or the Federal Government. Also includes $1,881,000 and $2,180,000 to be reimbursed by local interests for water quality control and recreation features, respectively.

[2] Non-Federal interests to bear one-half of the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, currently estimated at $2,180,000, and pay $1,881,000 for water quality control.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$4, 520, 000	$62, 000	$4, 582, 000
Maintenance and operation	1, 147, 000	187, 000	1, 334, 000
Total	5, 667, 000	249, 000	5, 916, 000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			2, 094, 000
Hydroelectric power			6, 503, 000
Water quality control			2, 730, 000
Recreation			958, 000
Total			12, 285, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1.

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction of the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir project local interests will be required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest one-half of the separable costs of the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir project allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amount involved currently being estimated at $2,180,000; reimburse the costs allocated to water quality control

currently estimated at $1,881,000; bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated on an average annual basis at $187,000. Local interests would also be required to furnish assurances that they will hold and save the United States free from any claims for damages from storage of water; and provide adequate waste treatment at the source within a reasonable period of time and preserve existing and augmented low flows for intended water quality purposes as contemplated under the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of West Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget recommends that the hydroelectric power features described in the project report not be authorized for Federal construction at this time. Further consideration of Federal development should be deferred pending completion of action on the application by the Federal Power Commission. Should the Commission act favorably, it would be expected that the power company would undertake the power development within a reasonable period of time. Should the Commission act unfavorably on the application or should the power company fail to undertake the power development within a reasonable period of time, consideration could then be given to whether the power features should be authorized for Federal development. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, subject to consideration of the above recommendation, there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the proposed reservoir development has a very good benefit-to-cost ratio and that the hydroelectric power produced could be readily utilized in the area power loads. The committee also notes that provision of the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, which is located in the Appalachia depressed area, would significantly improve the economic condition of the region.

The committee is in accord with the provisos contained in S. 2300 which were designed for the purpose of assuring that the Federal Power Commission would be fully free to arrive at a decision at its own discretion concerning any applications for private development of the power features of the project.

Crutcho Creek, Okla.

(S. Doc. 47, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Crutcho Creek is a right-bank tributary which joins the North Canadian River at Oklahoma City.

Authority.—Resolution of the Senate Commerce Committee adopted June 5, 1944.

Existing project.—There is no Federal flood control project on Crutcho Creek.

Flood problem.—Flooding on Crutcho and Little Crutcho Creeks has occurred as often as three or four times in a year as a result of heavy rainfall over the watershed and inadequate channel capacity to carry the runoff

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of 6.6 miles of channel straightening and enlargement including diversions and about 10,000 feet of channel clearing and snagging.

Estimated cost (price level of 1964)

Federal	$1, 801, 000
Non-Federal	969, 000
Total	2, 770, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$73, 900	$39, 700	$113, 600
Maintenance and operation		31, 000	31, 000
Total	73, 900	70, 700	114, 600
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			126, 000
Increased land utilization			46, 500
Total			172, 500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including spoil disposal areas; hold and save; maintain and operate; make relocations and/or alterations to existing buildings, highways, highway bridges, sewers, and other related facilities, except railroads; prevent encroachments on existing and improved channels; and inform affected interests at least annually that flows exceeding channel capacity may occur which may cause flood damages. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Oklahoma: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—This project is a worthy improvement providing flood protection to part of Oklahoma City south of the North Canadian River and the adjacent suburbs which will add to the overall flood protection system for Metropolitan Oklahoma City.

Des Moines River, Iowa

(Modification of H. Doc. 651, 78th Cong.)

Existing project.—The project for flood protection at Des Moines, Iowa, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, provided for the construction of levees and floodwalls and appurtenant structures and sewer alterations. Part of the project would consist of enlarging existing levees and embankments which are crossed by many sanitary sewer and storm drainage outlets.

Problem.—Paragraph 10(a)(2) of the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document 651, 78th Congress, recommended that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains as a part of the local cooperation required for the project. The costs of repairs and provision of gates for the existing drains was estimated at $1,900 in House Document 651 and was limited to repair of existing gates and provision of flap gates on the ends of existing drains. Current criteria for local flood protection projects require that existing drains under the line of protection be removed and replaced with heavy watertight structures and new sluice gates. The current policy of the Department of Army in the construction of local flood protection projects provides that the Federal Government pay for alteration of sewers and drainage structures and other utilities passing through the line of protection within the limits of rights-of-ways for levees and floodwalls. This includes the provision of adequate gating facilities. This policy has been applied to local flood protection projects generally for the past 20 years.

Remarks.—The committee noted that the items of local cooperation recommended during the preparation of the report vary from the local requirements based on current policies applied to local protection projects. The committee believes that the existing project should in equity be modified to reflect current policies for works of this nature.

East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, N.Y.

(H. Doc. 215, 89th Cong.)

Location.—West reach of south shore of Long Island and Jamaica Bay, N.Y.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955, and section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—Numerous groins have been constructed by local interests along the entire oceanfront, and the United States has constructed a groin system at Fort Tilden. These groins have been generally effective in containing both the original beaches and the sand placed as artificial nourishment. During the past 40 years, local interests have deposited nearly 12 million cubic yards of sand along the ocean shore.

Flood problem.—Extensive damage has been inflicted to boats and property due to shore erosion and wave attack along this coastal area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A hurricane barrier, 4,530 feet long, across the entrance to Jamaica Bay with a 600-foot navigation opening and two 150-foot gates which would partially close the opening to 300 feet; dikes and levees, 1.2 miles long to high ground north from the barrier and dikes, levees, and floodwalls, 7.7 miles long, south and east from the barrier to and along the oceanfront to high ground at the eastern end of the Rockaway Peninsula; fill placement along the 6-mile oceanfront floodwall with a berm 100 to 200 feet wide at 10 feet above mean sea level; stoplog structures, stairways, ramps, road raising, and other appurtenant works, including fishing platforms on the hurricane barrier; and Federal participation in the cost of periodic beach nourishment of the shore protection works for 10 years after completion of the initial beach fill, the Federal share presently estimated at 50 percent of such cost.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1963)

Federal	$32, 620, 000
Non-Federal	20, 476, 000
Total	53, 096, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1, 234, 000	$577, 800	$1, 811, 900
Maintenance, operation and replacement		193, 100	193, 100
Periodic nourishment	240, 600	326, 400	567, 000
Total	1, 474, 700	1, 097, 300	2, 572, 000
Annual benefits:			
Shore protection			1, 410, 000
Hurricane protection			1, 925, 000
Barrier fishing			232, 000
Total			3, 567, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow areas, necessary for the construction of the project; accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations and relocations of buildings, streets, storm drains, utilities, and other structures made necessary by the construction; bear 32 percent of the total first cost, a sum presently estimated at $16,976,000, consisting of $125,000 for items listed above, and a cash contribution of $16,851,000, provided that the cash contribution be paid either in a lump sum prior to commencement of construction, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; provide an additional cash contribution for the barrier, its gates and fishing platforms, equivalent to the present worth of the annual cost of maintenance, operation, and major replacements by the United States, an amount presently estimated at $3,500,000, subject to adjustment based on detailed design of project features, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction; hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages that may arise before, during, or after prosecution of the work; maintain during the economic life of the project, continued public ownership and use of the non-Federal publicly owned shores upon which the Federal participation in beach protection is based; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, except the barrier, its gates, and fishing platforms and provide periodic nourishment during the economic life of the hurricane and shore protection works, as may be required to serve the intended purpose, subject to Federal participation in the cost of periodic nourishment of the shore protection works for an initial period of 10 years, as otherwise provided herein; control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers; and at least annually inform interests affected that the hurricane improvements will not provide substantial protection against hurricane and storm tide levels higher

than about 3 feet above the elevation of hurricane Donna of September 12, 1960. Local interests have indicated that they are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of New York: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to the submission of the proposed report to the Congress. However, the Bureau of the Budget notes that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers have recommended that field studies and hydraulic model investigations be conducted in connection with the final design of the project to determine the specific effects of the proposed hurricane barrier on water quality, fish and wildlife, and currents in Jamaica Bay. The Bureau of the Budget concurs in this recommendation.

Remarks.—Because of the extensive damage that has been inflicted to boats and property due to wave attack and shore erosion along this coastal area, the committee considers that the project is urgently needed.

East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois

(H. Doc. 329, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The East St. Louis leveed area is located on the left bank of the Mississippi River across from the city of St. Louis, Mo. It extends from Cahokia Creek diversion channel on the north to Prairie du Pont Creek on the south, a distance of about 20 miles.

Authority.—Resolutions of the House Committee on Public Works, adopted June 17, 1948, and August 20, 1957, and the Senate Committee on Public Works, adopted July 18, 1957.

Existing project.—The existing Corps of Engineers' flood-control project for East St. Louis provides for raising and enlarging the existing levee system along the Mississippi River by the construction or reconstruction of 22 miles of levee including a section of floodwall, together with necessary appurtenant works consisting of gravity drainage structures, closure structures at highway crossings, alteration and reconstruction of existing pumping plants, service roads on levee crown, seepage correction measures, and alterations to railroad bridges and approaches at levee crossings. The project is scheduled for completion in June 1966.

Flood problem.—About 1,400 acres in the vicinity of the Blue Waters ditch are subject to overflow causing extensive damages to residential development when drainage is blocked by high stages on Prairie du Pont Creek outside the south-flank levee. Also, hillside runoff overflows existing channels and floods 18,000 acres, including residential developments and agricultural lands.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of detention areas enlargement and extension of existing channels, construction of a pumping station for the Blue Waters ditch area, a detention reservoir on Little Canteen Creek, and appurtenant facilities for protection of the upper Cahokia Canal, Harding ditch and Blue Waters ditch areas. It also provides for reconstruction of the low-water dam near the mouth of the Cahokia Creek diversion channel.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1962)

Federal	$6, 180, 000
Non-Federal	3, 160, 000
Total	9, 340, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$188, 800	$96, 500	$285, 300
Maintenance and operation		80, 400	80, 400
Loss of productivity on land		29, 200	29, 200
Total	188, 800	206, 100	394, 900
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			794, 700
Increased land use			45, 500
Total			840, 200

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; hold and save the United States free from damages; make all relocations of and modifications to highway bridges, streets, roads, sewers, and utilities; maintain and operate all the works after completion including removal of silt and debris from impoundment areas and channels in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; prevent encroachment on improved channels, ponding areas, and detention areas including the reservoir, and if encroachment occurs or capacities are impaired, provide substitute storage or equivalent pumping capacity promptly without cost to the United States; and at least annually notify interests affected that the project provides partial protection from the larger floods. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that this important industrial and residential segment of Metropolitan St. Louis suffers from periodic flooding as a result of storm runoff in excess of channel capacity. The improvement will aid in further development of the area and improve the well-being of the residents.

Eel River, Calif.

(H. Doc. 234, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Eel River has a drainage area of about 3,600 square miles and discharges into the Pacific Ocean in northern California. The delta area under consideration in this report is about 9 miles wide along the ocean and narrows to about 1 mile approximately 11 miles inland.

Authority.—Flood Control Act of 1936, resolution of the House Committee on Flood Control adopted August 5, 1939, and resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted June 13, 1956.

Existing project.—The existing Federal flood control project provides for 3 miles of levee along the north bank of Eel River and 1 mile of levee along Strongs Creek near Fortuna.

Flood problem.—Damaging floods in the delta area occur about once every 2 years and bank erosion in this area is a continuing source of loss of valuable farmland.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Levee and channel improvements extending 15 miles upstream from the mouth of Eel River and 4 miles upstream from the mouth of Salt River.

Estimated cost (Price level of 1963)

Federal	$13, 732, 000
Non-Federal	3, 060, 000
Total	16, 792, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$534, 000	$119, 000	$653, 000
Maintenance and operation	0	40, 000	40, 000
Total	534, 000	159, 000	693, 000
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented			389, 000
Land enhancement			342, 000
Recreational boating			39, 000
Total			770, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; provide access road and parking facilities adjacent to boat-launching ramp; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate project including recreation facilities; prevent encroachment on flood channels and ponding areas and prevent unsupervised use of boat-launching area that would impair effectiveness of the project; modify or relocate all utilities, roads, and bridges; and adjust all claims regarding water rights.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The report of the special subcommittee on the December 1964 and January 1965 floods in the Northwest convinces this committee of the urgent need for flood protection in the Eel River Basin. Damages caused by these floods were catastrophic. Studies by the Corps of Engineers indicate that the proposed levees in the delta area would have prevented damages in the order of $7.7 million.

El Paso, El Paso County, Tex.

(H. Doc. 207, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The city of El Paso is in west Texas on the left bank of the Rio Grande in the reach which forms the international boundary between the United States and Mexico. The drainage area of the arroyos that flood El Paso and vicinity is 128 square miles, a large part of which is in the city limits.

Authority.—Section 206 of the Flood Control Act approved July 3, 1958.

Existing project.—There are no flood control improvements by the Corps of Engineers in the problem area under consideration.

Flood problem.—Floods from the steep arroyos reach high velocities which cause destruction of improvements and severe erosion of land in urban, suburban, and agricultural areas. Estimated value of property and improvements subject to flooding is over one-quarter billion dollars. Future average annual damages are estimated at $1,090,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The recommended project is a single-purpose, local protection project for flood control at El Paso. The project would be comprised of four independent elements, one of which would be in the northwest part of El Paso, one in the central part, and two, the Copper System and Bluff Channel, in the southeast part. The plan consists generally of detention dams, diversions, interceptor and outfall channels, and appurtenant structures. The proposed improvements in the northwest area and Bluff Channel in the southeast area would change flow conditions in an international, section of the Rio Grande. Therefore, it is recommended that the improvements in the central area and the Copper System in the southeast area be constructed as soon as practicable, and that construction of improvements in the northwest area and the Bluff Channel in the southeast area be deferred until such time as construction is initiated on the improvements which may be required to increase the capacity of the Rio Grande and its floodway by the International Boundary and Water Commission.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964)

Federal	$12, 493, 000
Non-Federal	3, 131, 000
Total	15, 624, 000

Project economics

Area	First costs	Annual charges	Total benefits	Benefit-cost ratio
Northwest:				
Federal	$3,344,000	$105,830		
Non-Federal	729,000	55,170		
Total, northwest area	4,073,000	161,000	$537,200	3.3
Central:				
Federal	7,310,000	231,300		
Non-Federal	622,000	67,700		
Total, central area	7,932,000	299,000	336,000	1.1
Southeast:				
Copper System:				
Federal	754,000	23,860		
Non-Federal	635,700	26,140		
Subtotal, Copper System	1,389,700	50,000	(53,500)	1.1
Bluff Channel:				
Federal	1,085,000	34,340		
Non-Federal	1,144,300	50,660		
Subtotal, Bluff Channel	2,229,300	85,000	(106,200)	1.2
Total southeast:				
Federal	1,839,000	58,200		
Non-Federal	1,780,000	76,800		
Total, southeast area	3,619,000	135,000	159,700	1.2
El Paso local protection project:				
Federal	12,493,000	395,330		
Non-Federal	3,131,000	199,670		
Total project	15,624,000	595,000	1,032,900	1.7

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make any alterations to existing improvements, other than railroads or improvements constructed and maintained by the United States, which may be required because of the construction works; prevent encroachment on all of the project works which would reduce their design capacities; take steps to prevent encroachment on existing defined waterways tributary to the project by zoning or other means such as enlargement, or other modifications, of the existing waterway facilities, to prevent the minor flood problems in these tributary waterways from developing into problems of serious proportions; and inform all concerned in a manner satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers that the project is designed to control floods originating above the structures and that some residual flooding may be expected from precipitation occurring below the structures. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to cooperate.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies:

Department of the Interior: Favorable
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of New Mexico: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

International Boundary and Water Commission: Concur, with the understanding that construction of improvements in northwest area and Bluff Channel be deferred until such time as construction is initiated on works that may be required on the Rio Grande by the Boundary and Water Commission.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—Indicated there was no assurance agreement will be reached between Mexico and the United States concerning modification of the Rio Grande project and in that event, alternative measures would be required for protecting parts of the city of El Paso. The Bureau expects that if an alternative plan is developed a showing of economic feasibility will precede any request for funds to initiate construction. Subject to consideration of this comment the Bureau has no objection to submission of the report to Congress

Remarks.—The committee finds this project a well-conceived and worthy undertaking. It notes the project would store no water beyond temporary detention for flood control, and accordingly, would have little or no effect on the flow regimen or water quality in the Rio Grande.

Elizabeth River Basin, N.J.

(H. Doc. 249, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Elizabeth River Basin is located within Essex and Union Counties in northeastern New Jersey.

Authority.—Section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1948.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal flood control project in the basin.

Flood problem.—Flooding in the basin may be either of fluvial or tidal nature or a combination of both types. Fluvial flooding usually occurs during the summer months, caused by high intensity rainfall of short duration, while tidal flooding is caused by hurricane-induced tidal surges. The largest known fluvial flood occurred in July 1897. It is estimated that a recurrence of that flood under present conditions would have a peak flow of about 5,200 cubic feet per second and would cause damages estimated at $3,700,000 on the basis of 1964 price levels. The two greatest floods of recent record occurred in September 1954 and September 1960 caused by hurricanes "Edna" and "Donna," respectively. Damages from a recurrence of those floods are estimated at $1,700,000 and $1,320,000, respectively.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of channel improvements, levees, floodwalls, an open flume, interior drainage facilities, reconstruction of bridges and approaches, and utility changes between North Avenue in Union and the mouth at Arthur Kill.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964)

Federal	$9,769,000
Non-Federal	2,431,000
Total	12,200,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$344,000	$93,100	$436,100
Maintenance and operation		80,000	80,000
Total	344,000	173,100	517,100
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			655,600

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, the costs and values incurred in the interest of hurricane tidal flood protection to be credited to the required local contribution to the project first costs allocated to hurricane tidal flood protection; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion including all dredging required in the channel to maintain the design depths in the tidal reach, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; reconstruct without cost to the United States all bridges and approaches except railroad bridges, and accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations and relocations of existing sewerage and drainage facilities, streets, utilities, and other structures made necessary by the construction, such costs and values incurred in the interest of hurricane tidal flood protection to be credited to the required local contribution to the project first costs allocated to hurricane tidal flood protection; bear 30 percent of the first costs allocated to hurricane tidal flood protection, including the items listed above, and a cash contribution presently estimated at $542,000 to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent work items in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers; take necessary action to protect the channels from future obstruction or encroachment including waste disposal that would reduce their flood-carrying capacity; take appropriate measures to control development in partially protected areas and fringe areas not included in the project with a view to preventing an undue increase in the flood damage potential; maintain the existing natural detention areas along the Elizabeth River between Union Avenue and Trotters Lane free from encroachment so as not to reduce their current detention capacity; provide any additional gravity outlets or pumping station capacities made necessary by any modifications to or encroachments on the ponding areas; bear any increased Federal costs for the improvement that may result from any subsequent requirements for parkway developments; and at least annually notify interests affected that the improvements will not provide complete protection from fluvial floods greater than that which occurred in July 1897. Local interests have indicated a willingness and ability to comply with these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies:

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended improvements are necessary for protection against recurrence of flooding in the basin.

Fishing River and Tributaries, Missouri

(H. Doc. 281, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Fishing River is a left-bank tributary of the Missouri River, nearing Kansas City in northwest Missouri.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate, adopted September 7, 1961, and of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, adopted May 10, 1962.

Existing projects.—There is no existing Federal project for flood control in the basin.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Two multiple-purpose reservoirs, one on Dry Fork and one on East Fork of the Fishing River.

Estimated cost (1964 price level)

Federal	$7,260,000
Non-Federal	(1)
Total	7,260,000

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$249,000
Operation, maintenance, and replacement	60,000
Total	309,000
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	152,400
Water supply	20,000
Water quality	9,600
Recreation, fish, and wildlife	315,000
Total	497,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to repay $2,055,000, based on present estimates, consisting of $499,000 for water supply, $765,000 for recreation, and $791,000 for flood control.

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Bear first and annual costs allocated to water supply currently estimated at $499,000 and $600, respectively; bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife currently estimated at $765,000 and $45,000, respectively; bear first and annual costs associated with flood control currently estimated at $791,000 and $9,600, respectively; obtain without costs to the United States all water rights needed for storage and use of water for project purposes, resolve any conflicts in water rights necessary to assure the water yields required; exercise to the full extent of their legal capability control against removal of streamflow made available for water quality control; contribute to the control of pollution of streams subject to low-flow augmentation by adequate treatment or other methods of controlling wastes at their source.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies:
State of Missouri: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
Department of Agricutlure: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Interior: Favorable.
Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.
Remarks.—The recommended plan of improvement provides for water supply and recreation as well as urgently needed flood protection for the city of Excelsior Springs, Mo.

Flint River, Ga.

(H. Doc. 567, 87th Cong.)

Location.—Flint River rises 350 miles above its mouth and 1,000 feet above mean sea level in the southerly outskirts of Atlanta, Ga., the largest city in the Southeast. It crosses the fall line, marking the division of the Piedmont Plateau and the Coastal Plain, between river miles 230 and 285, falling 370 feet in 55 miles. It joins the Chattahoochee River to form the Apalachiocola River, 108 miles above Apalachicola Bay, an arm of the Gulf of Mexico.
Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 1, 1948.
Existing project.—Local flood protection projects have been completed at Montezuma, Ga., and at Americus, Ga., under the general authority for small flood control projects. The authorized project, providing for multiple-purpose developments and supplemental channel work to give a channel depth of 9 feet and a minimum width of 100 feet in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee River upstream to Columbus, Ga., 268 miles, and 29 miles up the Flint River to Bainbridge, Ga., is in operation. Spewrell Bluff Reservoir on the Flint River, for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, and allied purposes, was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 30, 1963.
Problem.—The power needs of the Flint River are increasing rapidly. Power from projects in the Flint River could be used in power supply areas 23 and 24 as designated by the Federal Power Commission. Local interests desire extension of the navigation channel in the Flint River from Bainbridge to Albany and beyond. Annual flood damages below the fall line total $180,000, and productive values of farm and urban land would increase substantially if flood control were provided.
Recommended plan of improvement.—The comprehensive plan of water resource development consisting of five dams and reservoirs is recommended for general approval as a guide to the resource development of the Flint River Basin. The Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Reservoirs for hydroelectric power, flood control, general recreation, and fishing recreation are recommended to be authorized for construction. (Spewrell Bluff Reservoir also recommended in this report as the first step in the recommended plan was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 30, 1963.)

Estimated cost (price level of 1961)

	Lazer Creek	Lower Auchumpkee	Total
Federal	$40,378,000	$48,275,000	$88,653,000
Non-Federal	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total	40,378,000	48,275,000	88,653,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to bear ½ the separable costs of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement currently estimated at $850,000 for the Lazer Creek project and $1,350,000 for the Lower Auchumpkee project a total of $2,200,000.

Project economics

	Lazer Creek	Lower Auchumpkee	Total
Annual charges:			
Federal	$2,158,000	$2,397,000	$4,555,000
Non-Federal	70,000	112,000	182,000
Total	2,228,000	2,509.000	4,737,000
Annual benefits:			
Power	2,206,000	2,085,000	4,291,000
Flood control	82,000	380,000	462,000
General recreation	254,000	404,000	658,000
Fishing recreation	174,000	276,000	450,000
Navigation	9,000	15,000	24,000
Total	2,725,000	3,160,000	5,885,000
Benefit-cost ratios	1.2	1.3	1.2

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction of Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee Dams and Reservoirs local interests will be required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable costs of the projects allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amounts involved currently being estimated at $850,000 for Lazer Creek Dam and Reservoir and $1,350,000 for Lower Auchumpkee Dam and Reservoir; and bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amounts involved currently being estimated at $50,000 for Lazer Creek Dam and Reservoir and $79,000 for Lower Auchumpkee Dam and Reservoir, on an average annual basis.

Provided that the sizing and responsibility for development, operation, maintenance, and replacement of the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement features of the reservoirs may be modified depending upon the intentions of non-Federal interests regarding participation in the costs of these features at the time of reservoir construction and subsequent thereto, and that appropriate adjustments reflecting such modifications may be made in the allocation of costs to other project purposes.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: No objection.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

State of Georgia: Favorable; but also desires authorization of navigation improvements.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau states that section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 requires that power produced at reservoir projects under control of the Department of the Army be sold at rates which will recover costs of power production and transmission, including capital investment allocated to power, over a reasonable period of years. The Bureau further states that as a matter of policy a period of 50 years has been considered appropriate for the recovery of power investment. Such period was most recently affirmed by the Congress as a condition of the authorization of Laurel River Reservoir in the Flood Control Act of 1960.

Accordingly, the Bureau would expect that construction of the reservoirs, if authorized by the Congress, would not be undertaken until there is specific assurance that all cost allocated to power can be returned with interest within a period of 50 years.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee also notes that the power needs of the Flint River Basin are increasing rapidly, and the power produced from these improvements could be used in the present power system. The projects are necessary units in the overall plan of development of the Flint River Basin.

Gila River, Phoenix, Ariz., and Vicinity

(H. Doc. 216, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The tributary area comprises about 2,730 square miles lying north of the metropolitan area of Phoenix, Ariz. The major watersheds are those of Cave Creek, Dreamy Draw, Skunk Creek, New River, and Agua Fria River.

Authority.—Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938.

Existing project.—No Federal flood control project in the area covered in the report. Cave Creek flood control dam, completed in 1923, was financed by State, county, city, and private interests. Lake Pleasant Reservoir, located on Agua Fria River about 25 miles upstream from its confluence with New River, was constructed in 1927 by the Maricopa County Municipal Water Conservation District No. 1. It is operated for water conservation. Two irrigation canals of the Salt River project, the Arizona Canal and the Grand Canal, are operated to provide limited flood control.

Flood problem.—Floods result primarily from local thunderstorms of high intensity and short duration. Damage results from inundation, debris deposition, and bank and surface erosion.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The recommended plan provides for four dams and detention basins on Cave Creek, Dreamy Draw, Skunk Creek, and New River; the Union Hills and Arizona Canal diversion channels; and channel improvements on Cave Creek, Dreamy Draw, Skunk Creek, New River, and Agua Fria River

Estimated cost (price level of October 1963)

Federal	$58,310,000
Non-Federal	[1] 12,490,000
Total	70,800,000

[1] Includes $1,370,000 cash contribution.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,885,000	$415,000	$2,300,000
Maintenance and operation	0	228,000	228,000
Loss of productivity of land	0	212,000	212,000
Total	1,885,000	855,000	2,740,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			7,750,000
Increased utilization of land			460,000
Total			8,210,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.0

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including spoil-disposal areas, necessary for construction of the project; perform all necessary construction, alteration or relocation of highways, roads, highway bridges, and street modification; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate the works after construction; contribute in cash 2.3 percent of construction cost, presently estimated at $1,370,000, for land enhancement benefits; prevent any encroachment on the existing or improved channels or within the detention basins that would reduce their flood-conveying or storage capacities; and hold and save the United States free from water rights claims resulting from construction, maintenance, and operation of the project.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable..
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Arizona: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The proposed works will provide protection for a populous, rapidly growing metropolitan area where control is needed for the runoff from local high intensity thunderstorms.

Gila River, Indian Bend Wash, Ariz.

(H. Doc. 303, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Indian Bend Wash, a part of the Gila River Basin, has a drainage area of about 224 square miles in Maricopa County, Ariz., and flows into the Salt River about 10 miles east of Phoenix.

Authority.—Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938.

Existing project.—There are no completed Federal projects for flood control. The Salt River channel clearing project authorized

for construction by the Corps of Engineers is at the lower end of Indian Bend Wash. The Arizona Canal of the Salt River project, a Bureau of Reclamation project operated by local interests, crosses Indian Bend Wash about 7 miles upstream from the mouth.

Flood problem.—Because of inadequate channel capacity, a highly developed residential area in the city of Scottsdale is subject to damages from floods. Agricultural, irrigation, public highway, and utility properties in the area are also subject to flood damage.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Seven miles of concrete lined channel extending from the Arizona Canal to Salt River.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1961)

Federal	$7, 250, 000
Non-Federal	1, 770, 000
Total	9, 020, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$205, 700	$64, 550	$270, 250
Maintenance and operation	0	22, 000	22, 000
Total	205, 700	86, 550	292, 250
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			530, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way including spoil disposal areas; accomplish all necessary modifications or relocations of highways, bridges, utilities, and irrigation facilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate the completed works; prevent encroachment on the improved channel; notify at least annually affected interests that the project will not provide complete flood protection; any increase in costs incurred solely to reduce flood easement lands required should be borne by local interests. The Board of Supervisors of Maricopa County and the Flood Control District of Maricopa County have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Arizona: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The proposed channel improvements would prevent potential flood damage to residential, agricultural, and utility properties in a rapidly growing residential area in the city of Scottsdale.

Gila River, Santa Rosa Wash, Ariz.

(H. Doc. 189, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Santa Rosa Wash, a tributary of Santa Cruz River in the Gila River Basin, is south of Phoenix and northwest of Tucson, Ariz.

Authority.—Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938.

Existing project.—There are no Federal improvements for flood control on Santa Rosa Wash. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has constructed a number of small check dams to pond water for cattle. Local interests have constructed some levee and channel improvements which are inadequate.

Flood problem.—The highly developed agricultural area north of the Papago Indian Reservation is subject to flood damage.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction by the Corps of Engineers of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir for flood control, irrigation, and recreation; construction by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of an irrigation project with facilities for recreation and fish and wildlife downstream from dam. Entire project to be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Estimated cost (all Federal, September 1962 price level)

Corps of Engineers	$5,375,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,055,000
Total	[1] 6,430,000

[1] Includes $37,500 which would be reimbursable by local interests under the provisions of Public Law 72, 89th Cong.

Project economics

Annual charges (all Federal):	
Interest and amortization	$210,000
Maintenance and operation	[1] 62,000
Total	272,000
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	527,000
Irrigation	124,000
Recreation and fish and wildlife	109,000
Total	760,000

[1] Includes $18,000 which would be a non-Federal responsibility under the provisions of Public Law 72, 89th Cong.

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.8.

Local cooperation.—Establish and enforce floodway limits and regulations to maintain the hydraulic capacity of the existing channel; hold and save the United States free from damages; adjust all water-rights claims; and make available appropriate rights to those lands required for construction of dam and reservoir.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Arizona: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to the Congress. However, the Bureau notes that minor specific costs for recreation and fishery developments are proposed to be borne federally. Because the reservoir would be located on Indian tribal lands, the usual provisions for land acquisition and public access are not being proposed in connection with the project. In view of this situation, the Bureau would recommend that the specific recreation and fishery facilities should be deleted as part of the project, and left for separate develop-

ment by the Papago Indian Tribal Council. Alternatively, the Bureau would recommend development of recreation and fish and wildlife in accordance with the provisions of the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act, introduced as H.R. 5269 and S. 1229, and would expect that, prior to such development, public access to project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife purposes would be guaranteed.

Recommendations of the Secretary of the Army.—After consideration of the report in the light of the comments of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Army recommends the improvements as proposed by the Chief of Engineers subject to the additional requirement that the recreation and fish and wildlife facilities be developed in accordance with the provisions of the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act and that prior to such development, public access to project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife purposes would be guaranteed and assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army for participation in the recreation and fish and wildlife development would be furnished by the Papago Indian Tribal Council.

Remarks.—The committee notes that possibilities presented to it for recreation and fish and wildlife development range from development as a project feature at full Federal expense to separate development by the Papago Indians. The committee believes that satisfactory arrangements for such development can be achieved under the provions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, and that authorization of the project should be on this basis.

Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana

(H. Doc. 184, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Grand Isle sector of the Louisiana coast lies about 50 miles south of New Orleans and it includes a region of lowlands and marshes extending parallel to Bayou Lafourche extending about 70 miles inland.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—No Federal project for hurricane protection in the area. Local interests have constructed a ring levee at Golden Meadow, about 20 miles northwest of Grand Isle.

Flood problem.—The low land elevations, ranging from 2 to 4 feet on Grand Isle and the mainland as far inland as Golden Meadow increasing to about 8 feet in the vicinity of Larose, are subject to inundation and damage in the developed areas and agricultural lands.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a levee to protect the area adjacent to Bayou Lafourche extending about 19 miles between Golden Meadow and Larose, with floodgates at the two crossings of the Bayou Lafourche Waterway, and gated drainage structures.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1960)

Federal	$5, 500, 000
Non-Federal	2, 357, 000
Total	7, 857, 000

Projec teconomics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$182,400	$81,300	$263,700
Maintenance, operation, and replacement		29,800	29,800
Total	182,400	111,100	293,500
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			329,300
Land enhancement			52,200
Total			381,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow areas and spoil-disposal areas; make alterations to roads, pipelines, cables, wharves, oil wells, and any other facilities; bear 30 percent of the total project cost, a sum presently estimated at $2,357,000, to include the items above and a cash contribution presently estimated as $823,000, or equivalent work specifically undertaken as an integral part of the project after authorization and in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; and prevent any encroachment on ponding areas unless substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity is provided promptly without cost to the United States. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Louisiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget noted that the benefits evaluated for the Golden Meadow-Larose protection levee may be overstated. The Bureau stated that land enhancement benefits appear to be in substantial part merely another measure of the value of flood damages to be prevented by the project and thus not fully creditable in assessing project feasibility. On the basis of information furnished by the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau commented that elimination of the benefits and evaluation of the project on current interest rates and prices would result in a benefit-cost ratio of 1.05. The Bureau recommends that prior to any request for funds for construction of the project the economic evaluation be reviewed and adjusted to eliminate any duplication in the calculation of flood control benefits. Subject to consideration of this recommendation the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the proposed improvement provides for protection of a 20-mile segment of the higher alluvial land adjacent to Bayou Lafourche. Although the Bureau of the Budget pointed out a possible duplication in the benefits claimed for the project, the project is still justified without the benefits in question. The committee further notes that nearly 3,000 persons reside in the

area south of Golden Meadow where protection could not be economically justified so that the proposed improvement could provide an important refuge area during a storm period for the permanent residents, as well as tourists visiting the coastal area, benefits which are not easily evaluated. The committee believes the improvement is justified and urgently needed.

Grand River, Grandville, Mich.

(H. Doc. 157, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The city of Grandville is located on the main stem of Grand River in the southwestern portion of Kent County, Mich.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 16, 1950. (This is an interim report in response to the above authority.)

Existing project.—There are no Corps of Engineers flood control projects at Grandville.

Flood problem.—Parts of Grandville are flooded in varying degrees on the average of once a year with 10 major floods having occurred since 1900.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement consists of about 10,000 feet of levee, two closure structures, and associated interior drainage works, including a storm-drain interceptor system and a pumping plant.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1961)

Federal	$1,373,000
Non-Federal	55,000
Total	1,428,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$49,600	$3,200	$52,800
Maintenance and operation		7,500	7,500
Total	49,600	10,700	60,300
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			75,000

Benefit-cost-ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow areas, necessary for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; accomplish all relocations and alterations of streets, buildings, pipelines, utilities, bridges, and other structures (except railroad facilities) made necessary by the construction work; maintain and operate the project after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and prescribe and enforce regulations to prevent encroachment on rights-of-way needed for proper functioning of the project. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Michigan: Favorable.
Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.
Remarks.—The improvement will protect against the frequent flooding at Grandville.

Grand River and Tributaries, Missouri and Iowa

(H. Doc. 241, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Grand River Basin comprises about 7,900 square miles in northwestern Missouri and southwestern Iowa. The river is a left bank tributary of Missouri River about 250 miles upstream from St. Louis.
Authority.—Flood Control Acts of 1936, 1938, and 1946.
Existing project.—There are no federally constructed flood control improvements in the Grand River Basin. However, the Chillicothe Dam and Reservoir—now in inactive status—was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938; and the Missouri River Agricultural Levee project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, includes units at the mouth of the Grand River.
Flood problem.—Both droughts and floods have harassed the basin and Grand River discharges have aggravated flooding along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Damage within the basin from the June 1947 flood was estimated in excess of $22 million. Droughts, on the other hand, have created critical municipal water shortages in the past.
Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan consists of a system of multiple-purpose reservoirs and local protection works. The reservoirs, ranging in size from 183,000 to 2,720,000 acre-feet of storage capacity, would control 62 percent of the drainage area of the basin and provide a total of over 2½ million acre-feet of water conservation space. The plan includes about 100 miles of channel improvements and 210 miles of levees.

Estimated cost (price level of 1961)

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Reservoirs	$252,020,000	(1)	$252,020,000
Cnannel aud levee works	26,615,000	$2,902,000	29,517,000
Total	278,635,000	2,902,000	281,537,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to bear construction costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife currently estimated at $19,860,000.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Reservoirs:			
Interest and amortization	$8,666,000		$8,666,000
Maintenance, operation, and replacement	529,000	$101,000	630,000
Total	9,195,000	101,000	9,296,000
Levees and channels:			
Interest and amortization	812,400	87,800	900,200
Maintenance and operation	0	125,600	125,600
Total	812,400	213,400	1,025,800
Annual benefits:			
Reservoirs:			
Flood control			6,815,000
Water quality control			137,000
Recreation and fish and wildlife			3,600,000
Power			946,000
Total			11,498,000
Channels and levees: flood control		2,432,200	

Benefit-cost ratios

Reservoirs:		Reservoirs—Continued	
Pattonsburg	1.3	Brookfield	1.3
Trenton	1.3	St. Catherine	1.1
Mercer	1.5	Braymer	1.1
Linneus	1.0	Channels and levees	2.3

Local cooperation.—With respect to channel and levee works, provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction and maintenance of these works; including rights-of-way required for ponding of interior drainage; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; perform without cost to the United States all necessary alterations or replacements of bridges, roads, miscellaneous utilities, and other existing improvements required in connection with these works, except railroad bridges and approaches; prevent encroachment on the improved channels that would impair their capacity; operate and maintain each element of the work after its completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Chief of Engineers; with respect to the reservoirs, contribute to the control of pollution of the streams subject to low-flow augmentation by adequate treatment or other methods of controlling wastes at their source; protect channels downstream from the reservoirs from encroachments which would adversely affect operation of the system; hold and save the United States free from all water-rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the reservoirs; and exercise, to the full extent of their legal capability, control against removal of streamflow made available by reservoir storage; bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with current policy, such amounts currently estimated at $19,860,000 and $101,000, respectively.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Recommended certain measures be taken as part of the project to insure continued efficient operation of the State's Fountain Grove Wildlife Area. The Chief of Engineers replied that the suggested measures could be included in the project and that he believes the estimates of

project cost are adequate to develop a satisfactory plan for uninterrupted operation of the wildlife area. Also, Interior noted that amounts to be reimbursed for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement have been combined, and indicated that the costs should be separated. The Chief of Engineers pointed out that the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act makes little distinction between recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement and that many details in the matter of cost sharing and reimbursement remain to be resolved. However, if such a separation becomes necessary he feels the matter can be worked out equitably between the corps and non-Federal interests.

Department of Agriculture: Commented that construction of the proposed reservoirs, particularly Pattonsburg and Trenton Reservoirs, would appear to adversely affect some watershed protection and flood prevention projects of the Department of Agriculture, and that these effects should be considered and the improvements coordinated prior to construction. The Chief of Engineers recognizes that close coordination of the two Departments is essential and that such coordination would be continued during preconstruction planning of the projects. The Department of Agriculture indicated that more comprehensive studies should be carried out in the basin. The Chief of Engineers pointed out that the Grand River Basin has been the subject of rather extensive studies by many agencies for many years, and that throughout the years, scales of project development and alternatives considered have been modified as necessary to reflect changing needs and conditions. Also, that as the recommended plan is developed all features will be considered again in detail and adjustments made as need be to meet existing conditions.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

Public Health Service: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Missouri: Favorable.

State of Iowa: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection. The Bureau of the Budget noted that the Department of Agriculture believes a review of possible adverse impacts associated with land acquisition for the seven reservoirs should be made and the Bureau expects such a review would be accomplished in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture prior to a request for funds for construction of the reservoirs. The Bureau also advised that it would expect a review of hydroelectric aspects of the Pattonsburg Reservoir prior to construction of that project.

Remarks.—The committee notes that Linneus Reservoir is of marginal feasibility, and that St. Catherine Reservoir, and the Honey Creek-No Creek channel improvement are only slightly favorable, all based on 2⅞-percent interest rate. On the basis of the interest rate currently in use, 3⅛ percent, the committee finds that Linneus and St. Catherine Reservoirs and the Honey Creek-No Creek channel improvement all fall below unity. The committee notes also that the proposed hydroelectric power development at Pattonsburg Reservoir is of questionable economic merit. Accordingly, the committee recommends adoption of the plan of improvement with these four features

omitted. On the foregoing basis the estimated cost of the project would be $218,009,000.

Grande Ronde River and Tributaries, Oregon

(H. Doc. 280, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Grande Ronde River is a tributary to the Snake River in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington.

Authority.—Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended.

Existing project.—Clearing and snagging on Grande Ronde at La Grande and bank protection on Catherine Creek at Union and on Wallowa River near Wallowa, Oreg. The 1950 Flood Control Act authorized levees and channel improvements in the Grande Ronde Valley from Elgin to La Grande and Union. This project has not been constructed. The Soil Conservation Service has partially completed levee, channel, and drainage improvements on Catherine, Pyle, and Ladd Creeks and Wright Slough.

Flood problem.—Damaging floods occur almost annually in the Grande Ronde Valley. Municipal water supply shortages exist at La Grande and Union and there is adequate water for irrigation for only 3,300 acres out of 26,400 acres of irrigated land. There are also water pollution problems. Local interests desire multiple-purpose reservoirs rather than local protection works.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Two multiple-purpose reservoirs, one on lower Grande Ronde River and one on Catherine Creek for flood control, irrigation, power, recreation, fish and wildlife, water quality control, and water supply.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

	Lower Grande Ronde	Catherine Creek	Total
All Federal	$12,526,000	$7,914,000	[1] $20,440,000

[1] Includes $6,705.700 allocated to irrigation, $652,600 allocated to water supply, and $1,423,000 allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife to be repaid by local interests.

Project economics

	Lower Grande Ronde	Catherine Creek	Total
Annual charges:			
International and amortization	$402,500	$254,200	$656,700
Maintenance and operation	81,000	72,000	[1] 153,000
Total	483,500	326,200	809,700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented	166,000	143,000	309,000
Irrigation	218,000	73,000	291,000
Water supply	24,000	12,000	36,000
Water quality control		85,000	85,000
Anadromous fish	11,000	16,000	27,000
Recreation	258,000	164,000	422,000
Power	13,000	6,000	19,000
Total	690,000	499,000	1,189,000
Benefit-cost ratio	1.4	1.5	1.5

[1] Includes $18,700 allocated to irrigation and $3,000 allocated to water supply, to be repaid by local interests and $6,0000 allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife which would be a non-Federal responsibility.

Local cooperation.—Repay the United States the construction costs and operation, maintenance, and replacement costs allocated to irrigation and water supply. Repay one-half of the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife and bear all costs of and assume responsibility for operation, maintenance, and replacement of these facilities. Exercise control over withdrawal of water below the projects necessary to insure that downstream benefits will be preserved. If repayment contracts satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior cannot be secured prior to initiation of construction, guarantee repayment of the costs of providing irrigation storage. Hold and save the United States free from all water rights claims. Provide adequate waste treatment as contemplated under the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1961.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Oregon: Favorable.

Recommendations of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army concurs generally in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. With respect to responsibility for construction of the Catherine Creek project and for operation and maintenance of the Catherine Creek and lower Grande Ronde projects, as between the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior, these are questions which the Secretary of the Army recommends for later determination by the President at the time of preconstruction planning when further definition of irrigation storage requirements will be available.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget recommends that authorization be in accord with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army. With respect to reformulation of the projects to exclude irrigation as a function if neither irrigation repayment contracts nor State guarantee of repayment of irrigation costs is forthcoming prior to construction, the Bureau understands that the Secretary of the Army would submit any such reformulated project to the President for his review and approval. With this understanding, the Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Remarks.—The committee takes note of the frequency of flooding in the Grande Ronde Valley and the need for storage of water for varied purposes. The recommended reservoirs are urgently needed to provide flood protection. The committee is not convinced of the need for delay in determination of responsibility for construction or operation and maintenance of any phase of the projects. The committee is convinced that in the interests of efficiency and avoidance of delay the projects should now be authorized for construction, operation, and maintenance by the Chief of Engineers.

Highland Bayou, Tex.

(H. Doc. 168, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Highland Bayou is a small coastal stream which flows southeasterly through Galveston County to enter Jones Bay about 5 miles northwest of Galveston, Tex.

Authority.—Section 204 of the Flood Control Act approved June 30, 1948.

Existing project.—No Federal flood control improvements on Highland Bayou.

Flood problem.—About 20,000 acres of urban and agricultural lands, including portions of the cities of La Marque and Hitchcock, are subject to overflow due to a channel that is inadequate to handle runoff from intense local thunderstorms and torrential rainfall associated with tropical storms.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Enlargement and rectification of Highland Bayou, construction of a dam about 8 miles above the mouth to divert flows from the upper watershed into the adjacent Basford Bayou, and construction of a diversion channel generally following Basford Bayou to Jones Bay.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1963)

Federal	$3,500,000
Non-Federal	1,370,000
Total	4,870,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$114,000	$45,000	$159,000
Maintenance and operation	0	37,000	37,000
Total	114,000	82,000	196,000
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			671,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.4.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction; provide all relocations and alterations of bridges, except railroad bridges, and of all buildings, structures, pipelines, sewers, utilities, and any other alterations of existing improvements which may be required for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; provide and maintain all lateral channels and drains that may be necessary for proper functioning of the project; prevent any encroachment on the flood-carrying capacities of improved channels; and at least annually, notify all interested parties that the project will provide protection from upstream flooding up to the standard project flood but will not provide protection from hurricane or storm tide flooding. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee is aware of the serious nature of the flood problem in the flood plain of Highland Bayou. This project provides a practical solution to this basin flood problem.

Hocking River Basin, Ohio

(H. Doc. 287, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Hocking River is a southeastward flowing tributary of the Ohio River, with its mouth at Hockingport, Ohio, about 200 miles downstream from Pittsburgh, Pa.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolutions adopted August 16, 1950, August 6, 1948, and June 13, 1956

Existing project.—The only Corps of Engineers project constructed within the basin is the Tom Jenkins Reservoir located on the east branch of Sunday Creek. The reservoir is operated for flood control, water supply, and recreation.

Flood problems.—Widespread flooding occurs along the main stem of the Hocking River causing severe and frequent damage in the city of Athens and surrounding areas.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The local protection works for Athens consists of enlarging and straightening about 22,000 feet of the existing channel of the Hocking River through Athens and clearing and snagging an additional 10,000 feet upstream and 3,000 feet downstream; placement of fill in the abandoned streambed and in low areas adjoining the new channel; construction of levees for partial protection between Mill Street and Richland Avenue; construction of a levee along the left bank opposite the mouth of Margaret Creek between State Highway No. 56 and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad; sewer and utility alterations and relocations; and construction of two highway bridges.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1964)

Federal	$4, 520, 000
Non-Federal	2, 600, 000
Total	7, 120, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$185, 000	$107, 000	$292, 000
Maintenance and operation		30, 000	30, 000
Economic loss of land productivity		15, 000	15, 000
Total	185, 000	152, 000	337, 000
Annual benefits: Flood damages prevented			460, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction local interests will be required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, spoil areas, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages

due to the construction works; maintain all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; perform without cost to the United States all necessary sewer, utility, highway, and highway bridge alterations; prevent any obstruction or encroachment that would reduce the flood-carrying capacity of the channel in the improved reach; provide that no habitable buildings with basements or with first floor elevations lower than 639 feet above mean sea level be constructed in the future along the left descending bank between Richland Avenue and Mill Street; and at least annually notify those affected that the improvements will not provide any substantial flood protection above the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad bridge and below Mill Street. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Ohio: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended project would provide needed flood protection to extensively developed urban areas, including the buildings of a leading university.

Housatonic River, Conn., Mass., and N.Y.

(H. Doc. 324, 88th Cong.)

Location.—In the western part of Connecticut and the southwestern corner of Massachusetts with a small area extending into New York.

Authority.—Resolutions adopted by the Senate Public Works Committee on February 4, 1949 and September 14, 1955, and by the House Public Works Committee June 13 and July 23, 1956.

Existing project.—Flood control improvements consists of seven reservoirs and four local protection projects, all located in the Naugatuck River Basin. A navigation project for the lower part of the river which provides for a channel 18 feet deep and 200 feet wide for a distance of about 5 miles and 7 feet deep and 100 feet wide for a distance of an additional 8 miles.

Flood problem.—With the reservoirs constructed, considerable damage would still occur at Danbury and Derby and local people desire flood protection.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Still River, Housatonic River Basin, at Danbury, Conn., for local flood protection by provision of channel improvement and appurtenant works; and improvement of the Housatonic and Naugatuck Rivers at Derby, Conn., for local flood protection by provision of floodwall, levee channel improvement, a pumping plant, and appurtenant works.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963)

	Danbury	Derby	Total
Federal	$2,300,000	$2,800,000	$5,100,000
Non-Federal	650,000	240,000	890,000
Total	2,950,000	3,040,000	5,990,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
DANBURY			
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$75,000	$21,200	$96,200
Maintenance and operation		1,000	1,000
Total	75,000	22,200	97,200
DERBY			
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	91,300	7,800	99,100
Maintenance and operation		10,300	10,300
Total	91,300	18,100	109,400

	Danbury	Derby
Annual benefits: Damages prevented	$116,200	$210,900

Benefit-cost ratio.—Danbury, 1.2; Derby, 1.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project including lands for spoil disposal, storm water pondage, and collector ditches together with necessary changes to sewage systems, highway bridges and roads, railroad track except railroad bridges and approaches, and other utilities; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; prevent encroachment on improved channels and on ponding areas and if capacity of the latter is impaired, provide equally effective storage, pumping capacity, or both, without cost to the United States; and prevent encroachment within 20 feet of the top of the west bank of Naugatuck River at the proposed channel widening upstream from the highway bridge at Derby. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Connecticut: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that despite the presently authorized upstream improvements considerable damage would still occur at Danbury and Derby, therefore, the improvements proposed in this bill are necessary.

Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa and Minn.

(H. Doc. 166, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The source of the Iowa River is in Hancock County, Iowa, while the Cedar River rises in Dodge County, Minn. Both streams flow southeasterly. Cedar River empties into the Iowa River at Columbus Junction, Iowa, 29.6 miles upstream from the mouth of the Iowa River; Iowa River enters the Mississippi River at a point 433.5 miles above the mouth of the Ohio River.

Authority.—HFCC resolution adopted July 16, 1945; SCC resolution adopted August 6, 1945; HPWC resolution adopted July 29, 1955.

Existing project.—There is one existing Corps of Engineers project in the Iowa and Cedar Basins, the Coralville Dam and Reservoir on the Iowa River, about 83 miles above the mouth of that stream, placed in operation in 1958. The Rochester Dam and Reservoir, on Cedar River about 2 miles upstream from the town of Rochester in Cedar County, is authorized but construction has been deferred for restudy. The primary purpose of these projects is to provide flood protection to areas downstream from the dams. The projects would provide no flood protection to the communities under consideration in this report. Under the provisions of section 205 of the 1962 Flood Control Act for small flood control projects, improvements on Beaver Creek at New Hartford, Iowa, have been authorized and an investigation is in progress on Iowa River and Otter Creek at Chelsea, Iowa. Other flood control improvements within the basin have been constructed by local interests and by the Works Projects Administration during the 1930's. These include reaches of levees and river walls at scattered locations.

Flood problem.—Flood damages have been significant in urban and rural areas in the Iowa-Cedar Basins and are expected to increase in the future. Because topography in the upper basins is not suitable for effective reservoir storage, local protection is the only physical alternative.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvements for flood control on Iowa River and Linn Creek at Marshalltown, Iowa; and on Cedar River and Blackhawk Creek at Waterloo, Iowa; to consist of levees, floodwalls, pumping plants, drainage structures, ponding areas, interceptor sewers, bridge modification and replacement, closure structures, and channel enlargement on Linn Creek; generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable.

Estimated cost (price level of April 1963)

	Marshalltown	Waterloo
Federal	$2,670,000	$14,900,000
Non-Federal	430,000	3,750,000
Total	3,100,000	18,650,000

Project economics

	Marshalltown			Waterloo		
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:						
Interest and amortization	$87,000	$14,100	$101,100	$492,800	$124,100	$616,900
Maintenance and operation		31,200	31,200		29,400	29,400
Total	87,000	45,300	132,300	492,800	153,500	646,300
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			194,500			799,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—Marshalltown, 1.5; Waterloo, 1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, including borrow, ponding, and spoil-disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; accomplish all relocations and alterations of buildings, utilities, highway bridges, roads, and other facilities (except railroad bridges) made necessary by construction of the project; and prevent any encroachment on the flood channels and ponding areas which would decrease their effectiveness, and if ponding areas and capacities are impaired, promptly provide substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity without cost to the United States; and provided further, that either plan may be constructed independently of the other when funds are available and the prescribed local cooperation therefor has been furnished. Local interests are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Minnesota: Favorable.

State of Iowa: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that careful consideration was given to numerous alternative plans for dealing with the water protection works at Marshalltown and Waterloo is the most practical solution.

James River and Tributaries, Jamestown, N. Dak.

(H. Doc. 266, 89th Cong.)

Location.—James River rises near the town of Fessenden, in central North Dakota, and flows north and eastward for about 50 miles, then almost due south through North and South Dakota to join the Missouri River near Yankton, S. Dak. It is about 710 miles long and drains an area of about 22,000 square miles, of which 6,200 are in North Dakota. Pipestem Creek, the largest tributary in North Dakota, joins the main river at Jamestown. It is about 50 miles long and drains an area of 594 square miles.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control and the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted November 10, 1943, and June 2, 1953, respectively.

Existing project.—Jamestown Dam and Reservoir, which includes 230,000 acre-feet of storage for flood control, was completed by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1953. The dam is on the James River about 1 mile upstream from Jamestown.

Flood problem.—The history of flooding on Pipestem Creek and the James River dates back to 1876. Average annual flood damages under present conditions, with the Jamestown Dam in operation, are estimated at $123,000, including $70,000 at Jamestown and $53,000 to crops, structures, and facilities in the downstream rural area. Under future conditions, it is estimated that these damages would increase to $208,000, with $139,000 occurring at Jamestown and $69,000 in rural areas.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on Pipestem Creek about 3 miles upstream from Jamestown, for flood control, recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement, and a wildlife management area to mitigate wildlife losses.

Estimated cost (price level of April 1964)

Federal	$3,083,000
Non-Federal	[1] 17,000
Total	3,100,000

[1] Non-Federal first cost of wildlife management area; non-Federal interests also to repay an estimated $136,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$109,200
Operation, maintenance and replacement	18,300
Total	127,500
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	206,000
Recreation and fish and wildlife	35,500
Total	241,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.9.

Local cooperation.—Bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, presently estimated at $136,000 for construction and $10,300 annually for operation, maintenance, and replacement; maintain and operate all improvements within the wildlife management area, for public use open to all on equal terms, and install at their own expense all improvements and necessary replacements thereto; obtain water rights needed for storage and use of water, and hold and save the United States free from damages due to water rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the project.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

State of North Dakota: Favorable.
State of South Dakota: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—This project would provide flood control, particularly for the city of Jamestown, N. Dak., in an area characterized by intermittent flooding and droughts. Also, it would provide a means for recreation and fish and wildlife development in the acea. The committee believes this project to be an important element in the overall development of water resources in the James River Basin.

JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, COLUMBIA RIVER, WASH. AND OREG.

(S. Doc. 28, 89th Cong.)

PROPOSED PROJECT MODIFICATION FOR ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LANDS FOR WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT

Authority.—Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, approved August 12, 1958 (Public Law 85–624). The modification would provide for acquisition of fee title to certain lands for wildlife purposes which will require specific authorization by Congress.

Existing project.—The John Day lock and dam was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1950 as a major component of the plan for development of the Lower Columbia River system for navigation and power. The dam will impound water 77 miles upstream. Construction of the authorized project was approximately 43 percent complete as of January 1, 1965.

Wildlife problem.—A study by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in cooperation with Oregon State Game Commission and Washington State Department of Game indicated that the John Day lock and dam project will destroy a portion of the habitat which is essential to a large segment of more than 7 million waterfowl utilizing the Pacific flyway.

Recommended plan of improvement.—To modify the project by acquiring additional lands, contiguous to lands for other project purposes, for establishing a waterfowl management unit. The total area proposed for development is estimated to be about 29,370 acres, of which about 16,790 acres would be water and 12,580 acres would be land. Besides project land amounting to 8,750 acres, an estimated 3,300 acres of private land and 530 acres of public lands will be required.

Estimated cost, Federal

Corps of Engineers	$676,000
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	680,000
Total	1,356,000

The land will be purchased by the Corps of Engineers. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be responsible for development, operations, and maintenance, including funding of these items.

Project economics

	Cost	Interest	Amortization	Total annual costs
Land purchase	$676,000	$17,745		$17,745
Development	680,000	17,850	$6,728	24,578
Operations and maintenance				66,000
Total	1,356,000	35,595	6,728	108,323

Annual benefits

Damages prevented	$34,000
Enhancement	112,000
Total	146,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.35.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Oregon: Favorable.

State of Washington: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee has considered the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, the director of the Game Commission, State of Oregon, and the director of the Department of Game, State of Washington, and the Chief of Engineers report on modifying the project for establishing a national wildlife refuge. The committee believes the refuge is desirable and that the modification should be authorized at this time. Because of planned industrial and commercial development in a portion of the Federal waterfowl management area as originally planned, the committee believes it appropriate to provide for deletion of the lands in question from the plan and substitution of other lands at an additional cost of $30,000.

John Martin Reservoir, Colorado

Authority.—The John Martin Reservoir project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, for flood control and conservation. Construction of the project was completed in 1948.

Plan of modification.—Establishment of a permanent pool of not to exceed 10,000 acre-feet. The necessary storage space would be provided by reducing the space allocated to flood control (280,000 acre-feet) by a like amount. Provided, that operation of the project for flood control purposes shall not be limited in any way, that rights of irrigators shall not be diminished or impaired, that the State of Colorado must obtain the water rights necessary to fill and maintain the permanent pool, and that operation of the permanent pool must be acceptable to the Arkansas River Compact Administration.

Estimated cost.—The proposed modification would be accomplished at no additional Federal cost.

Comment of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee believes that the proposed project modification would enhance the value and attractiveness of the reservoir at no significant loss to the flood control purpose. The bill authorizes the modification, subject to the referred-to conditions.

John Redmond Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kans.

(S. Doc. 27, 89th Cong.)

Authority.—Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, approved August 12, 1958 (Public Law 85–624). The modification would provide for acquisition of fee title to certain lands for wildlife purposes which will require specific authorization by Congress.

Existing project.—The John Redmond Dam and Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Act of May 1950 as a unit in the general comprehensive plan for flood control, water conservation, and other beneficial water resource uses in the Grand (Neosho) River Basin. The dam will impound water forming a conservation pool of 9,400 acres. Construction of the authorized project was about 99 percent complete as of April 30, 1965.

Wildlife problem.—A study by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife indicated that the Grand (Neosho) River valley is one of the principal migration routes for certain geese and ducks. Also, the John Redmond Reservoir is strategically located and provides an excellent opportunity to develop the waterfowl potential of the area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The national wildlife refuge as proposed will use the John Redmond Reservoir upstream from the town of Ottumwa, Kans. The total acreage proposed includes 24,020 acres of land and water. In addition to lands required for other project purposes, the refuge involves converting 3,400 acres from flowage easement to fee purchase within the reservoir area, and acquisition in fee of about 320 acres adjoining the reservoir.

Estimated cost, Federal

Corps of Engineers	$730,000
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	585,000
Total	1,315,000

The land will be purchased by the Corps of Engineers. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be responsible for development, operations, and maintenance, including funding of these items.

Project economics

	Lands	Development	Total
1st cost	$730,000	$585,000	$1,315,000
Investment	730,000	575,000	1,315,000
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	19,900	16,000	35,900
Operations and maintenance		75,500	75,500
Total	19,900	91,500	111,400
Annual benefits:			
Refuge			111,400
Local hunting			30,000
General recreation			25,000
Total			166,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Kansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee has considered the recommendations of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Corps of Engineers, for developing a national wildlife refuge in conjunction with the lands and waters of the project. The committee believes that the modification of the project is desirable.

Kaskaskia River Levees, Illinois

(H. Doc. 351, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The levees are located on the left and right banks of the Kaskaskia River in central Illinois between Cowden and Vandalia about 65 miles northeast of St. Louis, Mo.

Authority.—Section 209 of the Flood Control Act, approved October 23, 1962.

Existing project.—The authorized project for the Kaskaskia River provides for the construction of a dam near Carlyle, Ill., about 50 miles downstream from Vandalia and a dam near Shelbyville about 60 miles upstream from Vandalia, in addition to nine levee projects between Carlyle and New Athens, 6 levee projects between Cowden and Vandalia, and a local protection project at New Athens. Construction is underway on Carlyle and Shelbyville Dams and construction on the local protection project at New Athens was started in fiscal year 1965.

Problem.—Differences in policy in effect during the periods when the Cowden to Vandalia and the Carlyle to New Athens levees were under study resulted in the authorization of projects protecting predominantly agricultural areas in which the local interests of only one reach, Cowden to Vandalia, were required to make a cash contribution in recognition of land-enhancement benefits that would result from construction of the levees.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Under current policy no cash contribution would be required as an item of local participation in recognition of land-enhancement benefits due to the reduction in flood hazard if the levees between Cowden and Vandalia were recommended for construction at this time. Therefore, it is recommended that the cash contribution no longer be required in connection with construction of these levees.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

	Levees as authorized	Proposed modification	Project cost including modification
Federal	$5,442,000	+$3,498,000	$8,940,000
Non-Federal	4,538,000	−3,498,000	1,040,000
Total	9,980,000	0	9,980,000

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Federal	$344,000
Non-Federal	87,000
Total	431,000
Annual benefits	595,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Furnish necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; make all relocations and alterations to highways, roads, bridges, and utilities; construct drainage ditches; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and

operate; and make a cash contribution equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands acquired by the United States which, upon completion of the levee in district No. 22, will not be required for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Carlyle Reservoir. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the Chief of Engineers recommends the local cooperation for the levees authorized for construction in the Flood Control Act of 1958 be modified to conform to current policy. The committee considers this to be an appropriate adjustment.

Lake Pontchartrain, La., and Vicinity

(H. Doc. 231, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Lake Pontchartrain is in southeastern Louisiana north of and adjacent to the city of New Orleans.

Authority.—Section 6 of the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945. Resolutions of the Senate Public Works Committee adopted January 28, 1949, and February 4, 1957. Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—Federal improvements include the east bank Mississippi River levee, the Bonnet Carre Spillway guide levees, and the lakefront levee in Jefferson Parish; non-Federal improvements consist of levees, seawalls, and railway embankment along the lakefront from the Jefferson-Orleans Parish line to South Point, thence to and along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, to the inner harbor navigation canal, together with several cross-levees, canals, and pumping systems for interior drainage; a levee for protection of the Chalmette area, with pumps and floodgates for interior drainage; and a seawall along the lakefront at Mandeville on the north shore.

Flood problem.—The existing protective works for developed areas surrounding Lake Pontchartrain have been overtopped during recent hurricanes causing extensive damages in residential and commercial areas.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a levee and floodwall barrier from the eastern end of the existing levees to high ground east of the Rigolets, construction of new or enlargement of existing levees along the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain and the Intracoastal Waterway, construction of a new levee along the gulf outlet channel for the Chalmette area, together with repair and reinforcement of the existing seawall at Mandeville, to prevent entry of lake surges into the developed areas. The barrier would include a lock and floodgates in the Rigolets, a navigation gate and floodgates in Chef Menteur Pass, and a multiple-purpose lock in the inner harbor canal.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1961)

	Hurricane protection	Seabrook lock	Total
Federal	$51,942,000	$4,980,000	$56,922,000
Non-Federal	[1] 27,904,000	0	[1] 27,904,000
Total	79,846,000	4,980,000	84,826,000

[1] Includes a cash contribution equivalent to the estimated capitalized value of operation and maintenance of the Rigolets navigation lock, presently estimated at $3,950,000.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,735,000	$1,004,000	$2,739,000
Maintenance and operation	125,000	244,000	369,000
Total	1,860,000	1,248,000	3,108,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			52,432,000
Land enhancement			729,000
Total			53,161,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—17.1.

Local cooperation.—

For the hurricane protection plan: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow and spoil-disposal areas; make alterations and relocations to roads, railroads, pipelines, cables, wharves, drainage structures, and other facilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; bear 30 percent of the first cost, to consist of the fair market value of the items listed above and a cash contribution presently estimated at $18,028,000, or, as a substitute for any part of the cash contribution, accomplish in accordance with approved construction schedules items of work of equivalent value as determined by the Chief of Engineers; provide an additional cash contribution equivalent to the estimated capitalized value of operation and maintenance of the Rigolets navigation lock and channel to be undertaken by the United States, presently estimated at $3,950,000; provide all interior drainage and pumping plants required for reclamation and development of the protected areas; maintain and operate the project, except the Rigolets navigation lock and channel and the modified dual-purpose Seabrook lock; and acquire adequate easements or other interest in land to prevent encroachment on existing ponding areas unless substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity is provided promptly.

For the Seabrook lock: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow and spoil-disposal areas; and hold and save the United States free from damages. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Could not concur because of a conflict between proposed levee location and the interstate highway construction program. The Chief of Engineers understands that

the final design and location for Interstate Highway No. 10 have been approved recently. The highway would be carried on a trestle at an elevation that would clear the existing levee on the west side of Jefferson Parish and that would clear the proposed levee on the St. Charles Parish side of the borrow pit ditch. It is believed on this basis that the apparent conflict between the hurricane protection plan and the highway no longer exists.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Louisiana: Requested reconsideration of the non-Federal share of the project first cost and the operation and maintenance cost for the Rigolets locks because of the large past expenditures by local interests to provide protection and because the State believed the locks at the Rigolets were not an essential part of the hurricane protection plan but necessary only for navigation. The Chief of Engineers indicated to the State that Federal policy, as set forth in recent congressional authorizations for hurricane protection projects, provides that local interests bear not less than 30 percent of the construction cost of the new work which shall include credit for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations normally provided by non-Federal interests. When the fair value of the lands, etc., is less than 30 percent of the cost of construction, the difference shall be borne by non-Federal interests as a cash contribution or in equivalent work after project authorization. It is the opinion of the Chief of Engineers that in the absence of the hurricane protection barrier there would be no necessity for the Rigolets lock. The lock is viewed as an integral part of the hurricane protection plan to preserve the existing navigation between the Gulf of Mexico and Lake Pontchartrain with the costs of construction and operation and maintenance chargeable to the protection plan. However, since the need for the specific added feature is related to navigation, it is believed that performance of the operation and maintenance by the Federal Government subject to local repayment thereof, would be in the public interest.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget observed that the Seabrook lock was needed as much for the mitigation of the adverse effects resulting from construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet Channel as for hurricane protection, yet the costs were allocated 93 percent to mitigation of damages from the navigation facility and 7 percent to hurricane protection. Because the benefits from hurricane protection are several times greater than for the navigation project, the Bureau believes that a more reasonable alternative would be to allocate costs of the Seabrook feature equally between the two purposes. Subject to consideration of the comment, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army concurs in the views of the Bureau of the Budget that the costs for the Seabrook lock be allocated equally between navigation and hurricane protection which results in an additional cost of $687,000 to local interests and a corresponding reduction in the cost to the United States.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the apparent conflict between the hurricane protection plan and the location of Interstate Highway

No. 10 has been resolved. The Seabrook lock feature would serve both hurricane protection and improvement of the existing Mississippi River-Gulf outlet channel. The recommendations of the Secretary of the Army concerning this feature are considered by the committee to be appropriate.

Lee Creek, Western Arkansas and Eastern Oklahoma

(H. Doc. 270, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Lee Creek watershed lies north of the Arkansas River in western Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma. The basin, about 32 miles long and averaging about 14 miles in width, comprises an area of approximately 450 square miles, of which 267 square miles are in Washington and Crawford Counties, Ark., and 183 are in Adair and Sequoyah Counties, Okla.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, adopted May 2, 1946, and a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted July 31, 1957.

Existing project.—There are no existing flood control improvements in the Lee Creek Basin constructed by the Federal Government.

Flood problem.—Floods exceeding channel capacity occur on the Creek about once a year; the flood of 1960 inundated about 2,500 acres of agricultural land. Annual damages are estimated at about $29,000. The cities of Fort Smith and Van Buren are in need of additional supplies of municipal water.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A dam and reservoir at the Pine Mountain site on Lee Creek, for flood control, water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

Estimated cost (March 1964 price level)

Federal	$10,000,000
Non-Federal	[1]
Total	10,000,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to repay an amount estimated at $6,140,000 for water supply, and recreation and fish and wildlife.

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$345,000
Operation, maintenance and replacement	61,000
Total	406,000
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	$63,000
Water supply	342,000
Recreation, fish and wildlife	158,000
Total	563,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Bear first and annual costs allocated to water supply in amounts currently estimated at $5,940,000 and $22,000, respectively; bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, in amounts currently estimated at $200,000 and $28,000, respectively; hold and save the

United States free from water rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the project; and at least annually, inform interests affected that the project will not provide complete flood protection.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—
State of Arkansas: Favorable.
State of Oklahoma: Favorable.
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes this project will reduce damages from frequent floods in the basin and furnish urgently needed municipal water for the cities of Van Buren and Fort Smith. The committee believes that construction of the reservoir would enhance the recreation potential of the Ozark National Forest in which it would be located and the Devil's Den State Park located upstream. This will be a valuable unit to promote development of the resources of northwestern Arkansas.

Little Colorado River, Winslow, Ariz.

(S. Doc. 63, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The area under consideration comprises a drainage area of 26 square miles tributary to the Little Colorado River in Coconino and Navajo Counties, at and in the vicinity of the city of Winslow in northeastern Arizona.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted November 6, 1957.

Existing project.—There are no Corps of Engineers' projects for flood control. The Federal Aviation Agency has constructed a diversion levee and channel above Winslow Municipal Airport, to divert small and medium flows from Ice House Wash to Ruby Wash. Local interests have constructed other minor channel improvements along Ruby and Ice House Washes. These improvements do not adequately control flood flows.

Flood problem.—The washes rising southwest of Winslow and flowing through the urban and adjacent areas into the Little Colorado River flood plain are inadequate to carry without damage the floodflows resulting from the highly intense rainfall of local thunderstorms.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A diversion levee and channel 5.5 miles long extending from the Winslow Municipal Airport to the Little Colorado River, and enlargement of the Ice House Wash channel along a 2-mile reach.

Estimated cost (price level of September 1961)

Federal	$2,775,000
Non-Federal	165,000
Total	2,940,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$104,000	$8,000	$112,000
Maintenance and operation	0	11,000	11,000
Total	104,000	19,000	123,000
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			175,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands, easements and rights-of-way; accomplish all necessary modifications or relocations of highways bridges, utilities, irrigation facilities, and drainage works; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate works after completion; prevent encroachment upon improved channels and restrictive areas upstream from diversion levee. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Arizona: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—A serious flood problem exists at Winslow, and will cause greater damage in the future because of the continuing growth of the city. The committee notes that the proposed improvements will be effective in ameliorating this problem.

Little Nemaha River and Tributaries, Nebraska

(H. Doc. 160, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Little Nemaha River is a right bank tributary of the Missouri River in southeastern Nebraska. The basin has a length of about 60 miles and an area of 885 square miles.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted June 21, 1944.

Existing project.—There is no existing corps project entirely within the basin. A completed unit of the Missouri River agricultural levee project is located along the right bank of the Missouri River above and below the mouth of Little Nemaha River, with tieback levees along both banks of that tributary.

Flood problem.—The principal flood problem is in the lower segment of the basin, where average annual flood damages exceed $100,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Levees and appurtenant improvements on Little Nemaha River downstream from the vicinity of Brock to the upstream end of existing tieback levees, a distance of about 20 miles. Tributary tieback levees would be built along numerous tributary streams.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	$1,524,000
Non-Federal	236,000
Total	1,760,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$59,200	$9,200	$68,400
Maintenance and operation		4,700	4,700
Total	59,200	13,900	73,100
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			118,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and operation of these works, including those necessary for ponding of interior drainage; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; perform without cost to the United States all necessary alterations or replacements of bridges, roads, miscellaneous utilities, and other existing improvements, except railroad bridges and approaches, required in connection with these works; prevent encroachments on the improved channels that would impair their capacity; maintain and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and at least annually inform interests affected that the levees will provide protection against floodflows only slightly greater than that experienced during the flood of July 1958 at Auburn. Local interests have indicated their willingness to comply.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Nebraska: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The area to be protected by the project is subjected to frequent flooding and damage. It is noted that consideration was given to various methods of solving the flood problem, and the project as recommended is the most desirable. The project would be compatible with other developments in the area.

Little Rock Levee (East End-Fourche Bayou), Arkansas

(S. Doc. 55, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Little Rock is located on the south bank of the Arkansas River in the center of Arkansas. Fourche Creek rises in the Fourche Mountains about 15 miles west of Little Rock and flows eastward to join the Arkansas River at Little Rock.

Authority.—Resolution of the Senate Committee on Public Works adopted April 21, 1961.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project at Little Rock includes about 7 miles of levee and floodwall to protect the East End-Fourche Bayou area at Little Rock from floods on the Arkansas River and Fourche Creek.

Flood problem.—About 244 acres of commercial, industrial, and residential property are subject to flooding by impounded runoff from

Fourche Bayou when the gates through the levee are closed because of high stages on Fourche Creek.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a 45,000-gallon-per-minute pumping station and 164 acre-feet of sump storage to alleviate flooding from interior runoff within the leveed area.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1964)

Federal	$363,000
Non-Federal	95,000
Total	458,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$11,900	$3,100	$15,000
Maintenance and operation	0	8,100	8,100
Total	11,900	11,200	23,100
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			44,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project including waste-disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; provide lands or easements for sump areas; hold and save the United States free from claims as a result of flooding from ponded interior runoff during the operation of the project; maintain and operate all the works after completion; make any alterations to existing improvements; and prohibit encroachment on natural and excavated sump areas beyond that which presently exists; and if the capacity of these areas is impaired, provide promptly, without cost to the United States, substitute sump capacity or equivalent pumping capacity. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Public Health Service: Favorable.

State of Arkansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the need for additional flood protection at Little Rock has arisen since construction of the levees in 1950. The recommended plan would provide pumps to remove interior runoff during high river stages similar to that provided for other sections at Little Rock and prevent flood damages in an area that has undergone extensive urban development since construction of the levees.

Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, Calif.

(S. Doc. 53, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Lytle Creek rises in the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains and flows about 30 miles to Warm Creek which it joins about 1 mile upstream from the Santa Ana River.

Authority.—Resolution of the Senate Committee on Public Works adopted August 28, 1959.

Existing project.—There are two federally constructed local flood protection projects in the immediate vicinity. These are the Lytle and Cajon Creeks channel improvements completed in 1948 and the Devil, East Twin, and Warm Creeks channel improvements completed in 1961.

Flood problem.—Rapid urban growth and the accompanying increase in storm runoff have increased the size of floods in the area and commercial, industrial, and residential properties in the overflow area are subject to flood damage.

Recommended plan of improvement.—About 3.5 miles of paved channel along the East Branch of Lytle Creek; about 1.1 miles of revetted levees along Warm Creek; levee modifications at the downstream end of the existing channel on East Twin and Warm Creeks; and about 1 mile of revetted leveed channel on Santa Ana River.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	$9,750,000
Non-Federal	1,650,000
Total	11,400,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$320,000	$54,000	$374,000
Maintenance and operation	0	30,000	30,000
Total	320,000	84,000	404,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			409,000
Land enhancement			82,000
Advance bridge replacement			12,000
Total			503,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way. Hold and save the United States free from damages. Perform all necessary modification or relocation of highways and bridges, utilities, and irrigation and drainage facilities. Maintain and operate the works after construction. Adjust all water rights claims. Prevent any obstruction or encroachment that would reduce the flood-carrying capacities of the levee and channel improvements. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The existing improvements prevent about 69 percent of flood damages. The proposed additional improvements would increase the degree of protection to prevent about 93 percent of the

potential flood damages in the area. The improvements are needed for protection of a rapidly growing urban area.

Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River, Ky.

(H. Doc. 244, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The upper Cumberland River Basin, which contains 1,977 square miles, is that portion of the basin which lies above Cumberland Falls. The Cumberland River is formed by the junction of Poor and Clover Forks, 132 miles above Cumberland Falls. Martins Fork joins Clover Fork at the town of Harlan, Ky.

Authority.—Resolutions by the Public Works Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives adopted March 19 and June 19, 1963, respectively.

Existing project.—There are no existing Corps of Engineers flood control projects in the Martins Fork Basin.

Flood problem.—All reaches of Martins Fork except for the extreme upper reaches have flood problems. Floods are severe in the middle portions of the stream and become disastrous in the lower reaches. Harlan is the principal damage center.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on Martins Fork located at stream mile 14.8 in the interest of flood control, water quality control, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1964)

Federal	$4,860,000
Non-Federal	[1](345,000)
Total	4,860,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to reimburse the United States for one-half the separable costs of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$150,800	$11,500	$162,300
Maintenance and operation	15,000	35,000	50,000
Land productivity loss		2,300	2,300
Total	165,800	48,800	214,600
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			157,800
Water quality			114,000
Recreation			83,800
Total			355,600

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.7.

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction local interests are required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will prevent encroachment on downstream channels to the extent needed to provide for effective reservoir operation; at least annually notify interests affected that the project will not provide complete flood protection; hold and save the United States free from damages due to water rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the project; contribute to the control of pollution of the streams subject to low-flow augmentation by adequate treatment or other methods of controlling wastes at their source;

and exercise, to the full extent of their legal capability, control against removal of streamflow made available by reservoir storage for water quality control. In accordance with the Federal water project recreation cited above: administer project lands and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable first cost of the project allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amount involved currently being estimated at $345,000; and bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated at $35,000 annually.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Commonwealth of Kentucky: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the proposed Martins Fork Dam and Reservoir is located in the Appalachia depressed area. The construction and operation of the improvement would significantly improve the economic condition of this region.

Mississippi River and Tributaries (Lower)

(H. Doc. 308, 88th Cong. and H. Doc. 319, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The area embraced by the Mississippi River and tributaries project extends from Cape Girardeau, Mo., to the Head of Passes, La., near the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about 1,000 river miles. The project includes areas of the Mississippi River alluvial valley in the States of Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The area comprises about 35,000 square miles.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution June 12, 1954, other resolutions of the Senate and House Public Works Committees, and the Flood Control Acts of July 24, 1946, and May 17, 1950.

Existing project.—Provides for improvements on the main stem of the Mississippi River from Cape Girardeau, Mo., to the Head of Passes, near the Gulf of Mexico, in Louisiana, by means of levees, channel improvement and bank stabilization, control structures, and floodways, and improvement of many tributary areas afforded flood protection by the levees. Project includes maintenance of a 12-foot navigation channel from Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La., which is to be obtained in connection with the channel improvement works, and four commercial harbors. In the tributary areas, improvements include five reservoirs, levees, channel improvements, water control structures, and pumping stations for flood control and drainage. Separable improvements of the project in the tributary basins are administratively subdivided into individual projects, referred to in the report as "features" of the comprehensive Mississippi River and tributaries project. The features are included in table No. 1 on page 8 of the Chief of Engineers' report to the Senate Public Works Committee in hearing on House Document 308, 88th Congress.

Recommended plan of improvement.—

(*a*) Revetments to stabilize the river banks and protective works below Baton Rouge, La., to preserve the alinement of the Mississippi River below that point and protect the main stem levees from foreshore erosion.

(*b*) Levee improvements in the main stem levee system and modification of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway. Levee improvements in the main stem levee system consist of raising existing levees minor amounts at scattered locations to meet new flowlines and freeboard requirements established by the most recent storm and flood studies (1956). Modification of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway consists of raising the present grade of the fuse plug at Birds Point to 60 feet on the Cairo gage, putting the floodway into operation at 58 feet on that gage by artificially crevassing the levee when necessary, and enlarging the remainder of the Birds Point-New Madrid frontline levee to grades that will insure protection until the floodway is placed in operation.

(*c*) Improvement of the South Bank Arkansas River levees. These levees work in conjunction with the main stem levee system and the recommended work is of the same kind as that described for the main stem levee system above.

(*d*) Improvement of the South Bank Red River levees. These levees work in conjunction with the main stem levee system and the recommended work is of the same kind as that described for the main stem levee system above.

(*e*) Cairo-Mounds-Mound City area: Work consists of diversion channels at Mound City, necessary for the effective operation of the authorized Cache River pumping plant.

(*f*) St. Francis Basin: (1) Channel improvements for Locust Creek, Big Bay Ditch No. 1, Ditches Nos. 9 and 10 in Poinsett County, and Straight Slough Ditch, Arkansas; Varney River, Mo; and the Cockle Burr Slough-Buffalo Creek Area, Arkansas and Missouri, and acquisition of lands for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses.

(2) Improvements in the Big Lake Fish and Wildlife Refuge Area for fish and wildlife enhancement and flood control;

(*g*) Lower White River: Improvement of the existing local protection levee and associated drainage works at Clarendon, Ark., and channel improvements in the Big Creek Basin.

(*h*) Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon: Channel improvements in Mill and Vidal Bayous, La.

(*i*) Red River backwater area: Construction of a pumping plant and acquisition of lands and development for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses.

(*j*) West Kentucky tributaries: Channel improvements in Obion Creek for flood control and drainage.

(*k*) Yazoo headwater area: (1) Channel improvements in Alligator and Catfish Bayous, Bear Creek, and Whiteoak Bayou, and acquisition of lands and minor developments for mitigation of fish and wildlife losses.

(3) Installation of water control structures in the Will M. Whittington Channel for fish and wildlife enhancement.

(*l*) Yazoo backwater area: Water control structures in McCann Bayou for fish and wildlife enhancement.

(*m*) Big Sunflower River Basin: Water control structures for fish and wildlife enhancement.

(*n*) Lower Mississippi River Delta Region: Four salinity control structures for fish and wildlife enhancement.

Mississippi River and tributaries (lower)

[In thousands of dollars]

MAIN STEM FEATURES

Feature	Costs						
	Construction				Annual O. & M.		
	Purpose	Federal	Non-Federal	Total	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Channel improvement	(1)	145,219.0		145,219.0	3,000.0		3,000.0
Mississippi River levees (total)		2,165.0	5,000.0	7,165.0			
(*a*) General levee improvements	(1)	(1,325.0)		(1,325.0)			
(*b*) Birds Point-New Madrid Fldwy	(2)	(840.0)	(5,000.0)	(5,840.0)			
South bank, Arkansas River levees	(1)	36.0		36.0			
South bank, Red River levees	(1)	584.4		584.4			
Total main stem features		148,004.4	5,000.0	153,004.4	3,000.0		3,000.0
TRIBUTARY BASINS, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURES							
Cairo-Mounds-Mound City	(3)	48.0	45.0	93.0		0.5	0.5
St. Francis Basin (total)		8,362.5	7,760.0	16,122.5			
(*a*) Channel improvements	(3)	(5,469.5)	(7,760.0)	(13,229.5)		84.0	84.0
(*b*) Lands in backwater area	(4)	(1,955.0)		(1,955.0)			
(*c*) Improvements, Big Lake area	(3)	(938.0)		(938.0)		13.5	[5] 13.5
Lower White River (total)		7,950.0	1,900.0	9,850.0		100.0	100.0
(*a*) Clarendon levee	(3)	(178.0)	(23.0)	(201.0)		(1.7)	(1.7)
(*b*) Big Creek Basin	(3)	(7,772.0)	(1,877.0)	(9,649.0)		(98.3)	(98.3)
Boeuf-Tensas-Macon	(3)	350.0		350.0		6.0	6.0
Red River backwater area (total)		7,000.0		7,000.0			
(*a*) Pumping plant	(3)	(6,568.0)		(6,568.0)		110.0	110.0
(*b*) Lands and development, Larto Lake—Jonesville and Sicily Island	(4)	(432.0)		(432.0)		15.8	15.8
West Kentucky tributaries (Obion Creek)	(3)	1,906.0	824.0	2,730.0		18.0	18.0
Yazoo headwater area (total)		1,317.0		1,317.0	18.0		
(*a*) Channel improvements	(3)	(994.0)		(994.0)	(18.0)		18.0
(*b*) Lands and development, Hillside Floodway	(4)	(323.0)		(323.0)		4.9	4.9
Total tributary basins, flood control features		26,933.5	10,529.0	37,462.5	18.0	352.7	370.7
TRIBUTARY BASINS—SPECIFIC FISH AND WILDLIFE IMPROVEMENTS							
St. Frances Basin (Big Lake area)	(6)	874.2	59.8	934.0	8.0		[5] 8.0
Yazoo Headwater Area (Will M. Whittington Channel)	(6)	47.5	47.5	95.0		1.2	1.2
Yazoo backwater area (McCann Bayou)	(6)	44.0	44	88.0		8.0	8.0
Big Sunflower Basin	(6)	137.0	137	274.0		17.5	17.5
Lower Mississippi Delta region	(6)	5,068.5	5,068.5	10,137.0		251.0	251.0
Total tributary basins, F. & W. L. improvements		6,171.2	5,356.8	11,528.0	8.0	277.7	285.7
Grand total		181,109.1	20,885.8	201,994.9	3,026.0	630.4	3,656.4

[1] Flood control and navigation.
[2] Flood control.
[3] Flood control and drainage.
[4] Mitigation of fish and wildlife losses with costs charged to flood control.
[5] These Big Lake improvements serve both the flood control and fish and wildlife purposes. Total cost is $1,872,000, total maintenance $21,500 ($13,500 local for flood control and $8,000 Federal for fish and wildlife).
[6] Specifically for fish and wildlife enhancement.

Mississippi River and tributaries (lower)

[In thousands of dollars]

MAIN STEM IMPROVEMENTS

Feature	Federal annual costs	Non-Federal annual costs	Total annual costs	Annual benefits	Benefit-cost ratio
Channel improvement	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Mississippi River levees:					
(a) General levee improvements	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
(b) Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway	39.3	182.8	222.1	250.3	1.1
South bank, Arkansas River levees	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
South Bank, Red River levees	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
TRIBUTARY BASINS, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURES					
Cairo-Mounds-Mound City	1.7	2.4	4.1	(2)	(2)
St. Francis Basin:					
(a) Channel improvements	195.1	414.8	609.9	1,627.0	2.7
(b) Lands in backwater area	70.0		70.0	(3)	(3)
(c) Improvements in Big Lake area	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Lower White River:					
(a) Clarendon levee	6.3	2.7	9.0	(5)	(5)
(b) Big Creek Basin	274.0	181.8	455.8	793.2	1.7
Boeuf-Tensas-Macon	13.6	6.0	19.6	253.6	12.9
Red River backwater area:					
(a) Pumping plant	249.7	111.0	360.7	432.9	1.2
(b) Lands and developments, Larto Lake—Jonesville and Sicily Island	15.2	15.8	31.0	(3)	(3)
West Kentucky tributaries (Obion Creek)	67.3	53.1	120.4	(6)	(6)
Yazoo headwater area:					
(a) Channel improvements	35.1	18.0	53.1	114.4	2.2
(b) Lands and developments, Hillside floodway	11.4	4.9	16.3	(3)	(3)
TRIBUTARY BASINS, SPECIFIC FISH AND WILDLIFE IMPROVEMENTS					
St. Francis Basin (Big Lake area)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Yazoo Headwater area (Will M. Whittington Channel)	1.7	2.9	4.6	5.8	1.2
Yazoo backwater area (McCann Bayou)	1.6	7.4	9.0	16.5	1.8
Big Sunflower Basin (water control structures)	4.8	16.1	20.9	96.6	4.6
Lower Mississippi Delta region	179.0	430.0	609.0	932.3	1.5

[1] Main stem improvements: These features operate in conjunction with several other features to produce flood control, navigation, and other benefits. Total benefits are evaluated for comparison with the costs of all work completed and proposed. On this basis the benefit-cost ratio is 7.7for all main stem features combined.

[2] Cairo-Mounds-Mound City: This improvement works in conjunction with the authorized Cache River pumping plant. The economic evaluation therefore must include both portions of work. The combined benefiit-cost ratio is 2.1.

[3] Lands in backwater areas: This is a land purchase not chargeable to the work recommended for authorization, but to the entire features, both authorized and recommended for authorization. Its purpose is to mitigate fish and wildlife losses.

[4] Big Lake area: Improvements serve both flood control and fish and wildlife. Combined annual costs is $88,000 and includes operation and maintenance to be done by local interests at a cost of $13,500. Benefit-cost ratio is 1.2.

[5] Clarendon levee. Not susceptible of monetary economic evaluation; justified by need to preserve levee.

[6] West Kentucky tributaries. (Obion Creek): Corps of Engineers project is economically inseparable from project of Department of Agriculture. Combined annual cost is $155,000, and combined benefits $185,700; benefit-cost ratio is 1.2.

Local cooperation.—Local cooperation requirements for the work recommended for authorization are as follows:

(*a*) Channel improvements and associated work below Baton Rouge: None.

(*b*) (1) General levee improvements in main stem levee system: Provide necessary rights-of-way and borrow areas in accordance with section 3 of the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, as amended, by subsection (d) of the Flood Control Act of 1941, and section 10 of the act of December 22, 1944; and maintain completed works in accordance with section 3 of the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928.

(2) Birds Point-New Madrid floodway: Provide modified flowage easements to permit operation of the floodway at 58 feet on the Cairo gage by artificial breaching of the levees; hold and save; maintain levees after completion in accordance with 1928 Flood Control Act, as amended.

(*c*) South bank, Arkansas Levees: Maintain completed works in accordance with 1928 Flood Control Act, as amended.

(*d*) South bank, Red River levees: Maintain completed works in accordance with 1928 Flood Control Act, as amended.

(*e*) Cairo-Mounds-Mound City area: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works; provide interior drainage facilities for Mound City; provide street and highway culverts.

(*f*) St. Francis Basin: (1) Channel improvements: Provide lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works; make relocations of highway bridges.

(2) Big Lake area: Contribute 6.4 percent of the cost allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement, a contribution estimated at $59,800; hold and save; maintain flood control works.

(*g*) Lower White River: Clarendon, Ark.: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works. Big Creek: All the foregoing, and, in addition, make necessary improvements to highway bridges.

(*h*) Boeuf and Tensas River and Bayou Macon: Maintain works.

(*i*) Red River backwater area: Provide certain lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works.

(*j*) West Kentucky tributaries (Obion Creek): Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save; operate and maintain works; make alterations to highway bridges.

(*k*) Yazoo headwater area: Channel improvements for flood control: None. Fish and wildlife enhancement (Will M. Whittington Channel): Contribute half the cost of the improvement, a contribution estimated at $47,500; hold and save; maintain and operate works.

(*l*) Yazoo backwater area (McCann Bayou): Contribute half the cost of improvement, a contribution estimated at $44,000; hold and save; maintain and operate works.

(*m*) Big Sunflower Basin (water control structures): Contribute half the cost of improvement, a contribution estimated at $137,000; hold and save; maintain and operate works.

(*n*) Lower Mississippi River Delta region: Contribute half the cost of improvement, a contribution estimated at $5,068,500; hold and save; maintain and operate works.

Comments of States and Federal agencies.—The proposed report of the Chief of Engineers sent to the States and Federal agencies for comment was revised to include consideration of the comments received on that report. All State and Federal agencies concerned were furnished copies of the revised report.

State of Illinois: Favorable.

State of Missouri: By letter dated July 28, 1961, Missouri concurred in report. However, report recommendations on local cooperation changed during processing of report because of change in administrative policy regarding cash contribution. Original recommendation involved transfer of responsibilities between Federal and non-Federal interests for uathorized and

recommended work. Revised recommendation left local cooperation for authorized work unchanged and applied requirements of existing law and policy to works proposed for authorization. By letter dated June 12, 1964, the State recommended reverting to the local cooperation of the earlier version of the report.

State of Mississippi: Unfavorable. State urges further study be given to Yazoo backwater and Big Sunflower River features (review report on Big Sunflower now underway). Objects to procedures and criteria used in determining recommendations of of improvements of the project in Mississippi. In a letter dated August 30, 1962, the State commented on the revised report and reaffirmed these objections.

State of Arkansas: Generally favorable, but believed local cooperation requirements were too severe. (These were changed in accordance with new policy, which does not require local contributions due to land enhancement benefits.) State also commented that improvements were needed to prevent seepage in lands along the Big Lake Floodway near the Rivervale culvert. (The Chief of Engineers believes the best solution to the problem is improvement of the Cockle Burr-Buffalo Creek area recommended in the report.)

State of Louisiana: Generally favorable, but states it is not necessarily in agreement with all details of the plan. Hopes local cash contribution for the Tensas-Cocodrie pumping plant will not be required. (The report was revised in accordance with present policy, which does not contain this requirement.) Requests reclassification of certain fish and wildlife improvements from the "enhancement" to "mitigation" measures category. (This was done in the revised report for several improvements, including those in Louisiana.)

Commonwealth of Kentucky: Favorable.

State of Tennessee: Generally favorable. Requests reclassification of certain fish and wildlife improvements from "enhancement" to "mitigation" measures category and inclusion in the Mississippi River and tributaries project of additional fish and wildlife improvements. (These reclassifications were made in the revised Chief of Engineers report.) Desires fish and wildlife improvements for Forked Deer and Obion Rivers which were not included in the report's recommendations. (Subject report does not recommend any improvements for authorization in Tennessee.)

Department of the Interior: Requested reclassification in categories (mitigation, enhancement, etc.) of certain fish and wildlife improvements from the classifications presented in the original report. Also requested certain improvements in the Big Lake area of the St. Francis Basin in addition to those presented in the original report. (Report was revised to include these changes.)

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: No objection.

Federal Power Commission: No objection.

Department of Commerce: No objection.

Department of Agriculture: Recommends that before report is sent to Congress the corps consult with the Soil Conservation Service to determine whether further main channel works (i.e., major drainage channels in tributary basins) should be recom-

mended in report. Also recommends that provision be included in report for close collaboration between the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers for orderly development of land and water resources. Points out differences in local cooperation requirement in recommended works; questions criteria used to determine eligibility of areas for Federal drainage projects; suggests joint consideration with the corps to determine whether various improvements should be done by the Department under Public Law 566 or as a corps program. (Chief of Engineers replied that in view of the advanced stage of processing the report to Congress, he believes inclusion of the letters of the Department of Agriculture and of the Corps of Engineers with the report should serve to indicate the mutual intent of the two agencies to cooperate in the matter.) (Changed conditions since HD 308/88 studies are reflected in the updating of estimated project costs.)

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—

1. States that it would expect a reevaluation based on current price levels and conditions before funds are requested to initiate construction. This has been done.

2. (*a*) Recommends that improvements for fish and wildlife (listed in par. 67 of chief's report) be made subject to provision that costs be divided equally between United States and non-Federal entities, except for Big Lake area, covered in (*b*) following. (The Secretary of the Army concurs with BOB.)

(*b*) For Big Lake area, Budget recommends that non-Federal share determined as above be reduced to reflect benefits to existing Federal wildlife refuge adjacent to State area. (The Secretary of the Army concurs with BOB.)

3. Recommends that acquisition of lands in Hillside Floodway area be authorized for fish and wildlife purposes. These were recommended in the chief's report as a mitigation measure as part of the flood control project. (The Secretary of the Army concurs with BOB.)

Remarks.—The committee believes that modification of the Mississippi River and tributaries project is necessary to keep pace with the growth of the area and should be authorized at this time. The views of the committee follow on several specific matters:

Monetary authorization.—The committee considers it appropriate to increase the monetary authorization for this project in accordance with the basis established in the Flood Control Act of 1962 which provides that "monetary authorizations (for the lower Mississippi River project) heretofore and hereafter made available to the project or any portion thereof shall be combined into a single sum and be available for application to any portion of the project." Provision for increased monetary authorization is included in the bill.

Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway.—The floodway is operated to permit flows to pass through the area near Cairo, Ill., when they are too great to be contained by the natural river channel. This operation preserves and protects flood control works and areas outside the floodway area, while inundating lands within the floodway itself. Flowage easements for the existing Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway, and for other floodways in the alluvial valley, were acquired by the Federal Government. Accordingly, the committee is of the opinion that the modified flowage easements should be acquired by

the Federal Government, and the bill authorizes the floodway improvement on this basis.

Red River backwater area.—The committee believes that the pumping plant recommended for construction should be maintained and operated by the Corps of Engineers, as are similar pumping plants of the Mississippi River and tributaries project. The bill requires this.

Fish and wildlife enhancement.—The committee notes the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget concerning division of costs for fish and wildlife enhancement features, and the concurrence of the Secretary of the Army therein. The committee considers these recommendations to be in accordance with the cost-sharing principles of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, and that they are appropriate in this case. Subject to the cost sharing thus established, the committee believes that initial construction of fish and wildlife enhancement features should be accomplished by the Chief of Engineers.

St. Francis River Basin.—The committee believes the local cooperation requirement for the work recommended for authorization in the St. Francis River Basin should conform to that presently applicable to the authorized improvements in the basin. That requirement is set forth in paragraph (q) of section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946, which states: "Modification of the authorized project for the lower Mississippi River to provide that the local cooperation to be hereafter furnished for the works authorized in the St. Francis River Basin and the Yazoo River Basin shall consist of the requirement that responsible local interests agree to maintain levees in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 15, 1928, where maintenance is required under existing law."

Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana

(H. Doc. 167, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Morgan City sector of the Louisiana coast lies in the lower Atchafalaya River Basin about 70 miles west from New Orleans. It includes a region of lowlands and marshes about 30 miles long containing numerous bayous, artificial canals, and lakes.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—A system of levees and appurtenant structures have been constructed to protect portions of the area from headwater floods from the Atchafalaya River.

Flood problem.—Some of the existing levees have been overtopped by hurricane tides and severe storm damages were experienced. Also, the remaining lowlands are inundated and suffer extensive damage to property during the periods of storm tides.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The construction of about 6 miles of new levees with appurtenant drainage structures for protection at Morgan City; and, the enlargement of 21.6 miles of existing levee and construction of 3.1 miles of new levee with necessary drainage facilities for an area of about 32,000 acres in the vicinity of Franklin.

Estimated cost (price level of May 1963)

Federal	$3,049,000
Non-Federal	1,400,000
Total	4,449,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$97,400	$55,000	$152,400
Maintenance and operation		10,300	10,300
Total	97,400	65,300	162,700
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			351,900
Enhancement			59,400
Total			411,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.5.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction; make alterations to roads, pipelines, cables, wharves, drainage structures, and any other facilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; contribute in cash or equivalent work, as estimated below, not less than 30 percent of the total project cost, said 30 percent to include the fair market value of lands and relocations and the remainder in cash or equivalent work specifically undertaken as an integral part of the project after authorization and in accordance with approved construction schedules, the final determinations to be made after construction is completed:

Area	Total contribution	Lands and relocations	Cash or equivalent work
Morgan City:			
Subarea A	$482,000	$482,000	None
Subarea B	35,000	35,000	None
Franklin and vicinity	883,000	635,000	$248,000

Provide all interior drainage and pumping plants required for reclamation and development of the protected areas; maintain and operate; and prevent encroachments on existing ponding areas unless substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity is provided promptly, without cost to the United States. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet the requirements of cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Louisiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that in 1957 Hurricane Audrey caused extensive flooding in the area between Morgan City and Franklin and caused damages of nearly $1 million. Some protection is provided by the levees in the lower Atchafalaya Basin floodway but some of these have been overtopped by hurricane tides. This project will provide substantial additional protection against hurricane tides.

Napa River, Calif.

(H. Doc. 222, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Napa River drains an area of about 426 square miles and flows southward through Napa and Solano Counties into San Pablo Bay in the San Francisco Bay area.

Authority.—Flood Control Acts of 1938 and 1944, and resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted June 13, 1956.

Existing project.—There is no existing Corps of Engineers project for flood control. The Soil Conservation Service has been authorized to construct Redwood Creek Dam on Redwood Creek with a storage capacity of about 3,000 acre-feet for flood control and 13 miles of channel improvement along Napa River from Oakville to Napa, Calif. The existing Federal navigation project provides for a channel 100 feet wide and 15 feet deep from Mare Island causeway to Asylum Slough; thence 75 feet wide and 10 feet deep to Napa; and a turning basin 300 feet wide.

Flood problem.—High-intensity rainfall produced by general storms causes the river to overflow its banks at many locations causing much damage. Floods were responsible for four deaths between 1913 and 1940.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Channel enlargement and clearing, and construction of levees and floodwalls for a 10.7-mile reach from Trancas Road in Napa to the mouth at San Pablo Bay and boat-launching ramps.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	$14,950,000
Non-Federal	3,100,000
Total	18,050,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$473,500	$98,500	$572,000
Maintenance and operation	0	114,000	114,000
Total	473,500	212,500	686,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			515,000
Land enhancement			388,000
Recreational boating			106,000
Total			1,009,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; operate and maintain the works; make all necessary modifications or relocations of utilities, highway bridges and approaches, and highways and roads, exclusive of the railroad bridge and approaches; prevent encroachment on the channel works and ponding areas and if ponding areas and capacities are impaired, provide substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity; adjust all claims regarding water rights; provide lands, or rights in lands necessary to insure public control of the recre-

ational development; where the appraised value of such land amounts to less than 50 percent of the total first cost of the recreational development, make additional contributions sufficient to bring the non-Federal share to at least that level; operate and maintain the boat-launching ramps, access roads, parking areas, and necessary adjacent facilities for the boat-launching ramps, and assure access to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Severe and frequent flooding occurs in the Napa River Basin. The lack of adequate protective measures, especially in the city of Napa, results in a continued threat to life and high monetary losses. The proposed project is necessary to relieve this situation.

Neuse River, N.C.

(H. Doc. 175, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Neuse River Basin, situated in the eastern part of North Carolina, is roughly oblong in shape, approximately 180 miles long, with a maximum width of about 46 miles. The Neuse River is formed by the confluence of the Eno and Flat Rivers, about 8 miles north of the city of Durham, and has a drainage area of approximately 5,700 square miles.

Authority.—Resolution of the House of Representatives adopted June 13, 1956.

Existing project.—The only existing flood control project of a permanent nature constructed on the Neuse River by the Corps of Engineers is the cutoff at Goldsboro. This project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, consists of a flood channel across two adjoining bends of the river.

Flood problem.—The Neuse River Basin is subject to frequent and destructive flooding. Major floods usually occur as a result of heavy rainfall from thunderstorms, hurricanes, and tropical storms. Flood damage occurring in the Neuse River Basin averages about $1,256,000 annually.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Recommend construction of the Falls Dam and Reservoir in the interest of flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation, and other purposes. Also, it is recommended that a general plan of improvement including 12 other reservoirs be approved as a guide for future development of the water and related land resources of the basin.

Estimated cost (1963 price level)

Federal	[1] $18,600,000
Non-Federal	([2] [3])
Total	18,600,000

[1] Net cost to the United States, $16,245,000.
[2] Non-Federal interests to reimburse the United States for the entire construction cost allocated to water supply, currently estimated at $1,455,000.
[3] Non-Federal interests to bear ½ of the separable cost allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, currently estimated at $900,000.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$542,000	$72,000	$614,000
Maintenance, operation and replacements	75,000	45,000	120,000
Future recreation (discounted)		18,000	18,000
Economic cost of land	70,000	0	70,000
Total	687,000	135,000	822,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			564,000
Water supply			112,000
Low-flow augmentation			195,000
General recreation			1,690,000
Fishing			171,000
Total			2,732,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.3.

Local cooperation.—Prevent encroachment on downstream channels; pay the United States for all costs allocated to water supply presently estimated at $1,455,000 for construction and $10,000 annually for operation, maintenance and replacements; and bear first cost and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, in accordance with current policy, presently estimated at $900,000 and $35,000, respectively. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions

Comments of the State and Federal agencies—

Department of the Interior: Favorable subject to further coordination of future recreation and fish and wildlife requirements prior to construction.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

State of North Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress subject to further consideration of questions raised by the Department of Interior concerning (1) the proposed recreational development to meet the future needs of recreation; (2) lack of cost allocation data; and (3) the possibility that all Federal and non-Federal costs have not been included in the analysis.

Remarks.—The committee recognizes the desirability of protecting the flood plains of the Neuse River from disastrous flood damage. The Falls Dam and Reservoir project would be an effective initial step in controlling floods and provide needed water supply, water quality control and recreation in the basin.

New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina

(H. Doc. 183, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Neuse River drains about 5,700 square miles of eastern North Carolina. The Trent River, a tributary, joins the Neuse River at New Bern. At New Bern the Neuse River widens into a broad tidal estuary that empties into Pamlico Sound.

Authority.—Partial compliance with the authorization contained in Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, adopted June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal hurricane project in the area.

Flood problem.—Any sustained strong winds from the northeast quadrant on Pamlico Sound cause increased water levels in the Neuse River estuary with frequent damaging results in urban and other developed areas.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a hurricane-tidal barrier at the Cherry Point-Wilkinson Point site on Neuse River, N.C., to include an ungated navigation opening.

Estimated cost (1963 price level)

Federal	$10,400,000
Non-Federal	4,460,000
Total	14,860,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$423,400	$181,500	$604,900
Maintenance and operation	500	25,000	25,500
Total	423,900	206,500	630,400
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented:			
Present development			418,700
Future development			205,700
Recreation			24,400
Highway savings			27,100
Total			675,900

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—

(*a*) Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project;

(*b*) Bear 30 percent of the total project cost, exclusive of aids to navigation, a sum presently estimated at $4,460,000, to consist of the items listed in subparagraph (*a*) above, and a cash contribution presently estimated at $4,448,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs and values have been determined;

(*c*) Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works;

(*d*) Maintain and operate all the works, after completion, exclusive of aids to navigation, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and

(*e*) At least annually notify those affected that the project will not provide substantial reductions in tide level greater in height than that which occurred during Hurricane Ione in September 1955. Local interests have indicated a willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of North Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau notes that economic justification of the project requires inclusion of incidental benefits of two kinds: (1) Presumed savings in the cost of building a bridge that the district engineer's report indicates is not now being seriously considered by the State highway commission; and (2) recreational use of the barrier slope, for which no provision is apparently made for developing or maintaining access or supporting facilities.

Remarks.—The committee considers this project to be needed for hurricane protection at New Bern. However, the committee notes that economic justification is dependent on realization of benefits which, in turn, are dependent in considerable part on actions by local interests in regard to bridge construction and recreational use of the hurricane barrier slope. Accordingly, the committee considers it desirable that these benefits be reviewed carefully in connection with the evaluation studies normally made during preconstruction planning, taking into account the intentions of local interests at that time.

Ocracoke Island, N.C.

(H. Doc. 109, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Ocracoke Island is a part of the North Carolina Outer Banks, separating Pamlico Sound from the Atlantic Ocean.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955; and section 2 of Public Law 520, 71st Congress, approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—No Federal beach erosion control or hurricane project.

Erosion problem.—Measures are needed to prevent shore erosion and to stabilize Hatteras Inlet due to storm-driven waves.

Recommended plan of improvement.—For protection of the ocean frontage from hurricane and erosion damage, a beach fill with a berm 50 feet wide at an elevation of 7 feet above mean sea level in front of a dike with a top width of 25 feet at an elevation of 11 feet above mean sea level, a feeder beach near the north end of the island, periodic nourishment for a an initial period of 10 years, sand fences and vegetation; and for restoration and stabilization of the Ocracoke village frontage, beach fill to provide a berm with top elevation equal to that of the existing bank, but not exceeding 7 feet above mean sea level, vegetation and drainage facilities and periodic nourishment for an initial period of 10 years.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1962)

Federal	$1,636,000
Non-Federal	232,000
Total	1,868,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$65,000	$9,200	$74,200
Maintenance and beach nourishment	192,300	9,700	202,000
Total	257,300	18,900	276,200
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			42,400
Beach recreation			311,200
Total			353,600

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Contribute the initial costs of protecting the privately owned portion of the sound shore of Ocracoke village, a sum presently estimated at $88,000; contribute 7.2 percent of the initial costs of the hurricane protection features presently estimated at $69,000 and the present worth of future maintenance thereof estimated at $75,000 for a total of $144,000; provide all non-Federal lands, easements, and rights-of-way including borrow areas, necessary for construction of the project; accomplish all relocations and alterations of sewerage and drainage facilities, buildings, streets, utilities, and other structures made necessary by the construction; and furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that during the economic life of the project they will: contribute the portion of the periodic nourishment and maintenance costs of the privately owned sound shore of Ocracoke village, a sum presently estimated at $9,700 annually; hold and save the United States free from claims for damages due to construction, nourishment, or maintenance of the projects, including the laying of dredge pipelines across the highways or across private property; and at least annually inform interests affected that the project will not prevent inundation or provide any substantial protection from ocean surges higher in elevation than those of the hurricane of September 14, 1944.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of North Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The Committee recommends this project to prevent loss of life and hurricane damage on Ocracoke Island, and to preserve these natural barrier beaches for national recreation and park use.

Ouachita River, Monroe, La.

(H. Doc. 328, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The city of Monroe is situated on the left bank of the Ouachita River in northeastern Louisiana, about 70 miles west of Vicksburg, Miss., and 100 miles east of Shreveport, La.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Senate and the House Committees on Public Works adopted July 24, 1958, and June 3, 1959, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for the city of Monroe provides partial protection from floods on the Ouachita River by

levees and a floodwall on the left bank at Monroe and the right bank at West Monroe. The River and Harbor Act of 1950 authorized partial closure of a gap in the floodwall at Monroe which has not been constructed.

Flood problem.—During major floods local interests construct a mud-box type of emergency closure to prevent flooding through the gap. However, there is a possibility that an adequate structure could not be constructed in time or that it might fail leaving a highly developed urban area subject to flood damages.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a concrete wall approximately 1,890 feet in length, varying in height from 5 to 7½ feet, generally landward of the top bank of the river to fill the existing gap.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1962)

Federal	$520,000
Non-Federal	400,000
Total	920,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$15,900	$12,200	$28,100
Maintenance, operation, and replacements		1,700	1,700
Total	15,900	13,900	29,800
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented			85,900
Land enhancement			10,100
Total			96,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.2.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; make relocations and alterations of streets, buildings, equipment, utilities, and other obstructions made necessary by the construction works; hold and save the United States free from damages; and maintain and operate. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Louisiana: Favored closure of the gap but requested reconsideration of an alternative plan that would place the wall riverward of the buildings. The Chief of Engineers advised the State that it is the general policy of the Corps of Engineers to recommend for construction those elements or added increments where the added benefits exceed the added costs. It is the view of the Chief of Engineers that although construction of the floodwall adjacent to the river would protect an additional area not protected by the recommended plan the additional cost for this alternative plan is greater than the additional benefits that would result, and, therefore, should not be recommended to Congress. However, should local interests desire the alternative plan, and provided modification of the existing project is authorized by Congress, that plan could be constructed if local interests

are willing to pay the difference in Federal cost between the recommended plan and the alternative plan.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The recommended plan will close an existing gap in the flood protection system for the city of Monroe. The committee notes that as the need arises local interests have provided emergency closure at considerable cost and inconvenience. The committee believes that authorization and early construction of this urgently needed permanent improvement is desirable.

Pat Mayse Reservoir

Authority.—Pat Mayse Reservoir on Sanders Creek, Tex., was authorized in the Flood Control Act approved October 23, 1962.

Existing project.—The Pat Mayse Reservoir project provides for flood control, water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife. The dam would be located about 4 miles above the mouth of the stream where it joins the Red River in Lamar County, Tex. The reservoir would contain about 201,000 acre-feet of storage and would have an area of 7,950 acres at top of flood-control pool. The project is located within the former Camp Maxey Military Reservation.

Problem.—In acquiring lands for the Camp Maxey Military Reservation the Federal Government also acquired existing roads within the area. After the military reservation was deactivated, the General Services Administration began disposing of lands within Camp Maxey to private parties and various State and local public bodies. While no permits or rights-of-way were made available to the county by the Government, the former roads were again placed in service and the Lamar County performed some reconstruction and maintained the roads. These roads have come to be regarded as part of the public road system by the using public. The construction of Pat Mayse Reservoir will sever FM Highway 1499 and will make access to some of the lands sold by the Government less accessible and increase the travel distance to the county seat by some 15 to 20 miles. Since the Government owns the roads in these areas, it cannot relocate FM 1499 unless special authority is provided. In order to provide for continuation of existing traffic it would be necessary to relocate approximately 0.8 mile of the road at an estimated cost of $310,000.

Remarks.—Construction of Pat Mayse Reservoir will disrupt the use of FM Highway 1499, and the committee believes that the circumstances warrant the proposed relocation. Accordingly, the bill authorizes this relocation.

Phillippi Creek, Fla.

(H. Doc. 156, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Phillippi Creek Basin is in southwest peninsular Florida and is within Sarasota County except for a small fringe area in southern Manatee County.

Authority.—Flood Control Act of July 14, 1960.

Existing project.—There are no Corps of Engineers flood control projects in the Phillippi Creek Basin.

Flood problem.—Poor drainage and intense rainfall results in frequent flooding over much of the Phillippi Creek watershed. Thou-

sands of acres of low valley and plainlands flood almost yearly. The 1962 flood covered about 8,000 acres of land. Principal damages occur to agriculture and urban development. Salinity intrusion is also a problem.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Phillippi Creek, Fla., to provide primary works for flood control and major drainage by enlargement of the main stream and is major tributary channels, realinement of the channel at U.S. Highway No. 41, and provision of spillway and inlet structures, and appurtenant works; all generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	$4,592,000
Non-Federal	3,263,000
Total	7,855,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$179,000	$140,000	$319,000
Economic loss on lands	16,500		16,500
Maintenance, operations and replacements		34,800	34,800
Associated costs		8,400	8,400
Total	195,500	183,200	8,400
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			172,300
Increased land use			280,900
Recreational boating			22,000
Total			475,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 22 percent of the sum of the contract price and the costs of supervision and administration thereof for each part of the primary work to be provided by the Corps of Engineers, an amount presently estimated at $1,165,500, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to start of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final contribution to be determined after actual costs are known; construct and maintain the associated works needed to realize the benefits made available by the work to be provided by the United States (this requirement would not prohibit the assistance of other Federal and local conservation programs in constructing and/or maintaining lateral drainage works under authorizations not connected with this project); provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; provide without cost to the United States all necessary new highway bridges, alterations or replacement of bridges, roads, miscellaneous utilities, and other existing improvements, except railroad bridges and approaches; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; prevent encroachment on the flood-carrying capacity of the improved channels; and operate and maintain the works after

completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, except for the aids to navigation which would be maintained by the U.S. Coast Guard. Local interests are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes the problems of poor drainage, salinity intrusion, and frequent flooding of Phillippi Creek watershed. The committee believes the recommended improvements will alleviate these problems.

Pine Bluff Sewer Outfall, Arkansas

Authority.—The multiple-purpose plan of improvement of the Arkansas River and tributaries was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended.

Existing project.—Provides for improvement of the Arkansas River Basin by construction of coordinated developments for navigation, hydroelectric power, flood control, water supply, and other purposes. Navigation features provide for a channel 9 feet deep, widths of 150 feet and 250 feet, and about 450 miles long. Waterway will be canalized throughout its length by 18 locks and dams. Lock and dam No. 4 is being located on the Arkansas River about 7 miles east of Pine Bluff; construction of the lock and dam is now underway with completion planned in 1968.

Problem.—The existing Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff discharges untreated sewage into the Arkansas River. Gravity flow is maintained until the river stage reaches elevation 193.0. At present, sewage pumping is required when the river stage exceeds elevation 193.0 which is estimated to occur about 18 percent of the time. The proposed navigation pool elevation 196.0 created by lock and dam No. 4 would interfere with the present outfall 100 percent of the time. Since the city of Pine Bluff will be located on a slack water pool because of Boyd Point Cutoff, the moving of the Arkansas River will adversely affect the usefulness of the sewage system outfall disposal facilities owned by the city of Pine Bluff.

Plan of improvement.—Based upon total cost to all parties concerned, the most economical plan of accommodation is an extension of the present sewage line to a new outfall downstream of lock and dam No. 4 by constructing a 30-inch diameter force (pressurized) main with pumping plant and other appurtenant works. Under the terms of the Arkansas River navigation project, local interests would be required to operate and maintain the new sewer system.

Remarks.—The committee notes that because of increased pumping requirements involved in the plan, costs to the city of Pine Bluff for operation and maintenance of the substitute outfall will be substantially greater as compared with costs of the existing outfall. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the Federal Government reimburse the city for the capitalized cost of this increased operation and maintenance, and the bill so provides.

Platte River and Tributaries, Missouri and Iowa

(H. Doc. 262, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Platte River and its tributaries drain an area of 2,440 square miles in southwestern Iowa and northwestern Missouri, discharging into the Missouri River a few miles upstream from the Kansas Citys.

Authority.—The report is in response to resolutions of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, adopted November 3, 1943; of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, adopted November 10, 1943; and of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, adopted April 24, 1945.

Existing project.—Downstream from the mouth of the Platte River, a unit of the Missouri River agricultural levee program has been completed with a tieback levee extending along the left bank of the Platte. Another unit which will have a tieback levee along the right bank of the Platte River is in the preconstruction planning stage. There are three watershed projects of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in the basin.

Flood problem.—Flooding has occurred at Agency, Mo., and in the lower part of the basin during 29 of the past 40 years. The flood of 1947 caused damage in the basin estimated at $7.7 million. Average annual flood damage in the 113,780 acres of flood plain in the study reaches is estimately currently at $837,000. A foreseeable need exists throughout the basin for water conservation for water supply, water quality control, and water-based recreation. The needs are most urgent in the lower portion of the basin where an increased water supply is needed at Smithville and Kansas City, Mo.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Smithville Reservoir and improvement of the Platte River and Little Platte River channels. The Smithville Reservoir would provide flood protection for the city of Smithville and along the Little Platte and lower Platte Rivers, would furnish municipal water supplies for Kansas City and Smithville, would assure water quality control and a desirable flow for fish and wildlife below the dam, and would offer opportunity for outdoor recreation. The Platte River improvement would include 38 miles of channel realinement and enlargement from the mouth upstream to the vicinity of Agency, Mo. The Little Platte River improvement would involve 2.4 miles of channel rectification in the vicinity of Smithville, Mo.

Estimated cost (1964 price level)

	Smithville Reservoir	Channel works	Total
Federal	$21,500,000	$5,389,000	$26,889,000
Non-Federal	(1)	535,300	[1] 535,300
Total	21,500,000	5,924,300	27,424,300

[1] Local interests to repay the cost allocated to water supply, currently estimated at $7,144,000, and an amount currently estimated at $650,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife, a total of $7,794,000.

Project economics

Reservoir:	
Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$855,000
Operation, maintenance, and replacement	103,000
Total	958,000
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	119,400
Water quality	5,000
Water supply	359,000
Recreation and fish and wildlife	900,000
Total	1,383,400
Benefit-cost ratio	1.4
Channel improvements:	
Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$235,700
Operation, maintenance, and replacement	9,400
Total	245,100
Annual benefits: Flood control	301,600
Benefit-cost ratio	1.2

Local cooperation.—Reimburse the United States for all costs allocated to water supply storage, currently estimated at $7,144,000 for construction and $31,700 annually for operation, maintenance, and replacements; bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with law, presently estimated at $650,000 and $20,000, respectively; provide adequate waste treatment as contemplated under provisions of law; obtain without cost to the United States all water rights needed for storage and use of the water for project purposes; resolve any conflicts in water rights necessary to assure the water yields required for effective operation of the project; use the water in a manner consistent with State and Federal laws; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to storage and withdrawal of water by users; provide the usual legal requirements of local cooperation in connection with the channel improvement work, including the provision to prevent encroachments on the improved channels that would impair their capacities.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

State of Missouri: Favorable.
State of Iowa: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The recommended projects will protect against the frequent flooding which occurs on the agricultural lands in the lower basin and the towns of Smithville and Agency. Furthermore, the recommended Smithville Reservoir provides an important source of municipal and industrial water to serve the adjacent north Kansas City area and the convenient location to this urban area will make the reservoir attractive to meet the needs for water-based recreation.

The committee believes this project is important to continued development of Metropolitan Kansas City.

Rahway River, N.J.

(H. Doc. 67, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Rahway River Basin is in northeastern New Jersey within the Greater New York City metropolitan area.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, adopted September 14, 1955, and item in Flood Control Act of 1948.

Existing project.—There are no existing Federal improvements for flood control in the basin. The town of West Orange and the city of Orange in cooperation with the Works Progress Administration built a walled channel and culverts on the east branch at a cost of about $250,000. On both the main stream and tributaries, local interests have made numerous improvements including channel widening, deepening, and paving; wall construction; detention basins; and have established park areas in flood zones.

Flood problem.—Flooding on the Rahway River is an annual occurrence on the average. Floods can be either fluvial in the upstream reaches or tidal in the lower river, or both in rare instances. Recurrence of the highest floods of recent record would cause damages estimated at over $1,250,000. Over 50 percent of these damages would be incurred on the east branch at South Orange.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Local flood protection works at South Orange on the east branch of the Rahway River consisting of channel enlargement, construction of floodwalls, levees, a short flume section, reconstruction of four highway bridges with appurtenant road reconstruction and miscellaneous interior drainage facilities.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1961)

Federal	$1, 514, 000
Non-Federal	493, 000
Total	2, 007, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$57, 400	$18, 700	$76, 100
Maintenance and operation		3, 000	3, 000
Total	57, 400	21, 700	79, 100
Annual benefits: Damaged prevented			109, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make at their own expense all necessary changes to highways,

highway bridges and approaches, utilities, and miscellaneous existing improvements; protect the channels and other flood control works from future encroachment or obstruction that would reduce their flood-carrying capacity; and control development of the fringe areas not protected by the proposed improvement with a view to preventing an undue increase in the flood damage potential. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that recurrence of the highest floods of recent record would cause damages estimated at over $1,250,000 and that over 50 percent of these damages would be incurred on the east branch at South Orange. The proposed improvements at South Orange are urgently needed.

Roseau River, Minn.

(H. Doc. 282, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Roseau River Basin is in northwestern Minnesota and southcentral Manitoba, Canada.

Authority.—Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1944.

Existing project.—The Corps of Engineers has not constructed any projects in the basin. Canadian interests have constructed a floodway and channel control works which prevent overbank flooding of agricultural lands contiguous to the river along a 15-mile reach immediately downstream from the international boundary. In Minnesota, State and local agencies have constructed an extensive network of ditches and have done limited channel enlarging and straightening in a 40-mile reach of Roseau River upstream from the boundary. In the early 1950's the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba cooperated in developing the Roseau River game refuge and hunting grounds at a cost of $506,000.

Flood problem.—Flooding in the Roseau River Basin is especially severe when snowmelt is a factor. The largest flood of record occurred in the spring of 1950 and caused extensive damages to both agricultural and urban developments. Eighty-five thousand acres of farmland were flooded. Under existing conditions, average annual flood damages in the Roseau River flood plain are estimated at $483,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The Chief of Engineers recommends channel improvement and auxiliary levees from Roseau to the international boundary, and the furnishing of funds to Canada for construction of the necessary remedial works in that country presently estimated at $380,000.

Estimated cost (price level of May 1963)

Federal	$2,550,000
Non-Federal	394,000
Total	2,944,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$99,200	$15,300	$114,500
Maintenance and operation		8,000	8,000
Total	99,200	23,300	122,500
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			321,400
Deduct detriment, F. & W.L.			7,200
Total			314,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; provide without cost to the United States all relocations and local betterments required for the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the project works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; prevent encroachment on the improved Roseau River Channel in the United States; construct and maintain at their own expense the associated drainage works needed to effectively use and realize the benefits of the improved major channel; and organize a properly constituted legal entity under the laws of the State for cooperation with the United States in providing the required local cooperation including the necessary associated drainage works. Local interests are willing and able to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Minnesota: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau concurs in the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army that the plan for the Roseau River be modified to authorize the Chief of Engineers to adjust the cash contribution required of local interests to such amount as is recommended by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the President, such adjustment to be made at the earliest practicable date.

Remarks.—The committee notes the requirement for construction of necessary remedial works in Canada presently estimated at $380,000. The committee notes the relatively minor drainage problem in the flood plain and the contribution to the flood problem of runoff from areas outside the flood plain. The committee considers that cost sharing determined in accordance with the usual requirements for local flood protection projects to be appropriate. The committee accordingly recommends authorization of the project as recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

San Diego River (Mission Valley), Calif.

(H. Doc. 212, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The San Diego River Basin is 435 square miles in area. It flows into the Pacific Ocean about 20 miles north of the international boundary between the United States and Mexico. Mission Valley is in the lower portion of the basin, extending from river mile 3 to 13.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution, June 3, 1959.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project on the San Diego River consists of rock-revetted levees extending from the mouth to river mile 3.3.

Flood problem.—Floods in Mission Valley cause damage to transportation facilities, agricultural land and improvements, business and industrial property, utilities, and residential and public property.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a rectangular concrete channel on San Diego River with rectangular concrete sections on the downstream reaches of the tributary streams.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1963)

Federal	$14,600,000
Non-Federal	[1] 7,700,000
Total	22,300,000

[1] Includes $1,900,000 cash contribution.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$462,000	$244,000	$706,000
Maintenance and operation	0	45,000	45,000
Loss of land productivity	0	98,000	98,000
Total	462,000	387,000	849,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			685,000
Increased land utilization			377,000
Total			1,062,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; hold and save; maintain and operate; accomplish all necessary construction or relocation of highways, roads, bridges, utilities, and storm drains; contribute in cash 11.5 percent of construction cost, presently estimated at $1,900,000, for land enhancement benefits; prevent encroachment on the improved channels.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes the flood hazard in Mission Valley along the San Diego River and recommends authorization of the proposed works. The committee also notes that local interests desire to construct the recommended project works in Murphy Canyon in connection with a proposed sports stadium prior to initiation of construction of the project by the Corps of Engineers and in return for such construction receive credit toward their required local cash contribution. The committee considers that the public interest will be served if the works are constructed to the standards and criteria of the Corps of Engineers. The committee recommends that the Secretary of the Army be authorized to credit local interests against their required cash contribution to the project for such works accomplished after the date of project authorization if he approves of such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pa.

(H. Doc. 185, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Du Bois is located on both sides of Sandy Lick Creek in Clearfield County, Pa. Sandy Lick Creek rises in Clearfield County and flows into Redbank Creek, which is tributary to the Allegheny River.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 7, 1954, and House Public Works Committee resolution adopted March 30, 1955.

Existing project.—There is no existing Corps of Engineers project at Du Bois, Pa.

Flood problem.—Severe flooding along Sandy Lick Creek in the vicinity of Du Bois causes considerable damage to railroads, highways, industrial plants, churches, schools, recreation areas, and commercial development. Nine bridge crossings exist in the reach recommended for improvement. Appreciable damages have been experienced due to floods despite local protection measures.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Sandy Lick Creek for flood control by channel deepening, widening, and straightening, together with necessary railroad and highway bridge replacement. Relocations would include railroad tracks, city streets, and sewer and utility lines, beginning at a point on Sandy Lick Creek approximately 1 mile below the downstream city limits and extending almost 4 miles to the upstream city limits at Shaffer Road Bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1963)

Federal	$1,654,000
Non-Federal	408,000
Total	2,062,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$66,100	$16,300	$82,400
Maintenance and operation		7,000	7,000
Land productivity loss		900	900
Total	66,100	24,200	90,300
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			80,100
Area redevelopment			21,400
Total			101,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—With Area Redevelopment benefits 1.1; without Area Redevelopment benefits 0.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and borrow and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project; bear the cost of private highway bridge replacement, road relocations, railroad track shifts, electrical, communication, sewer, water, gas, oil, and other utility alterations required for the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; establish and enforce channel limit lines to prevent encroachment on the improved channel; maintain and operate the project works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and at least annually notify interests affected that the project will not provide complete flood protection. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of Pennsylvania: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee considers that the flood protection project proposed for Du Bois is urgently needed. The committee notes that the justification for the work is marginal but recommends authorization in view of the nature of the damages sustained by the community and the fact that it is located in the Appalachia depressed area.

Saw Mill River and Tributaries, New York

(H. Doc. 258, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Westchester County, N.Y., in the metropolitan area of New York City.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works, Senate, adopted September 14, 1955, two resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, Senate, adopted November 14, 1955, and two resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 13, 1956.

Existing project.—No existing Federal improvement for flood control.

Flood problem.—Flooding in the basin is annually and is estimated at $225,000. Damages from the maximum flood of record, October 1955, are estimated to be $1,714,000 under present conditions.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvements for flood control on Saw Mill River at Yonkers, N.Y., consisting of channel clearing, enlargement, and straightening; construction of a concrete flume in restricted areas; floodwalls, levees, drainage structures, and ponding areas; bridge modifications or replacements; and a railroad closure structure.

Estimated cost (1964 price level)

Federal	$1,924,300
Non-Federal	370,700
Total	2,295,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$76,500	$14,800	$91,300
Maintenance and operation		7,000	7,000
Total	76,500	21,800	98,300
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			173,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, including borrow, ponding, and waste-disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; provide without cost to the United States all alterations, relocations, and necessary replacements of existing facilities, including bridges, highways, sewers, including those storm sewers and drains required to convey interior drainage to improved channels or ponding areas, utilities, and railroad modifications and relocations other than bridges and bridge approaches, which may be required for construction of the project; protect the channel and other flood works from future encroachment or obstruction, including waste disposal, which would reduce or otherwise impair their flood-carrying capacity, or provide a pumping station or additional gravity outlets, as appropriate, to compensate for any loss in ponding area effectiveness due to the modification of or encroachment upon such areas; take appropriate measures to control development in partially protected areas and fringe areas not included in the project with a view toward preventing an undue increase in the flood damage potential; and at least annually notify those affected that flooding will still be possible from large floods. Local interests are willing and able to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that damages from a repetition of the maximum flood of record would cause damages estimated to be $1,714,000 under present conditions, and considers that this project is urgently needed.

Scotts Creek, Calif.

(H. Doc. 259, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Scotts Creek, a principal tributary to Clear Lake, is located in the Coast Ranges in northern California.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted May 29, 1946.

Existing projects.—The Corps of Engineers has constructed a levee along the lower left bank of Scotts Creek. Local interests have constructed low, discontinuous levees along Scotts Creek through Scotts Valley and the canyon reach below the valley.

Flood problem.—There are about 2,600 acres of land in the flood plain along Scotts Creek. Some flooding generally occurs each year. In addition to the flood damages produced in Scotts Valley and in the canyon reach, Scotts Creek floodflows contribute to damages. around Clear Lake. There is also need for additional development of the water resources for water supply and recreational purposes.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir for flood control, water supply, irrigation, and recreation, and downstream channel improvements and levees.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	[1] $9, 360, 000
Non-Federal	260, 000
Total	9, 620, 000

[1] Of this amount $2,600,000, $1,444,000, and $290,000 reimbursable by local interests for water supply, irrigation, and fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation, respectively.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$321, 000	$12, 000	$333, 000
Maintenance, operation, and replacement	[1] 37, 000	[2] 73, 000	110, 000
Total	358, 000	85, 000	443, 000
Annual benefits:			
Flood damage prevention			111, 000
Land enhancement			46, 000
Water supply			160, 000
Irrigation			98, 000
Recreation			145, 000
Total			560, 000

[1] Includes $13,000 and $5,000 reimbursable by local interests for water supply and irrigation.
[2] Includes $23,000 for fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation which would be a non-Federal responsibility.

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Make arrangements with the Secretary of the Interior for repayment of costs allocated to water supply and irrigation; furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; repay one-half of the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; bear all costs of and assume responsibility for operation. maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities; make necessary relocations and alterations to roads and bridges; hold and save the United States free from damages; prevent encroachment of any type that would impair effectiveness of project works; operate and maintain the completed levee and chan-

nel improvements; preserve or restore and maintain to capacities prevailing in 1963 the other channels of Scotts Creek from the damsite downstream to Middle Creek.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommended reservoir and channel works will provide needed multiple-purpose improvements.

Shidler Reservoir, Salt Creek, Okla.

(H. Doc. 242, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Salt Creek is a tributary of the Arkansas River in north-central Oklahoma.

Authority.—Section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, and also a resolution of the Senate Public Works Committee adopted February 21, 1958.

Existing project.—There is no Federal flood control project on Salt Creek.

Flood problem.—Annual flood losses are estimated to average $86,600. There is a need for a dependable source of water supply for municipal and industrial purposes and for water quality control.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A multiple-purpose reservoir on Salt Creek near Shidler, to serve the purposes of flood control, water conservation, and recreation.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963)

Federal	$6,150,000
Non-Federal	[1]
Total	6,150,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to repay an estimated $967,000 for water supply and $119,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife.

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$200,200
Maintenance, operation, and recreation	57,800
Total	258,000
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	131,300
Water supply	51,500
Quality control	28,500
Recreation	92,000
Total	303,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Reimburse the United States for all costs allocated to water supply storage, currently estimated at $967,000 for construction and $11,000 annually for operation, maintenance, and replacements; bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with current policy,

presently estimated at $119,000 and $13,600, respectively; hold and save the United States from water rights claims; keep local interests advised that the reservoir will not afford total flood protection. Local interests indicate willingness to meet all the requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: The Secretary of the Interior commented that the interests of the Osage Indians could be adversely affected by the project; and, that the plan does not provide adequately for protection of fish and wildlife resources. The Chief of Engineers assured the Secretary that planning and construction activities will be coordinated with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to insure fair and equitable adjustments for damages and adverse effects attributable to the project: also, that while much study was given the recreation and fish and wildlife aspects of the proposed project, these values will be reexamined prior to construction.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Public Health Service: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

State of Oklahoma: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget pointed out that a significant portion of the benefits from the flood control, recreation, and conservation functions of the proposed reservoir would not be derived for many years, and accordingly, that the project is substantially justified on the basis of expected future requirements. Accordingly, the Budget expects that prior to construction the conservation and flood control benefits, in particular, would be critically examined.

Remarks.—The committee notes that local interests strongly desire the project and have agreed to pay all costs assigned to them, including costs for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. The committee finds the project justified on the basis of established plan formulation criteria and notes that pursuant to his usual practice the Chief of Engineers will reexamine the project benefits prior to construction.

Skunk River-Ames Dam and Reservoir, Iowa

(H. Doc. 267, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Skunk River extends from the center of Iowa to its southeastern corner. Ames Dam site is on Skunk River about 5 miles north of the city of Ames.

Authority.—House and Senate Public Works Committee resolutions adopted December 18, 1945, and June 1, 1948, respectively. (This is an interim report in response to the above authority.)

Existing project.—There are no Federal flood control projects in the basin.

Flood problem.—Flooding on the Skunk River has occurred at frequent intervals and has resulted in extensive damage to crops and, to a lesser extent, rural property. The most severe flood occurred in May 1944 and resulted in damages of more than $4.4 million. Average annual damages in the Skunk River Basin, exclusive of the North Skunk River, are estimated at $1,357,500.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction and operation of a dam and reservoir on Skunk River at the Ames site about 5 miles upstream from Ames, Iowa, for the purposes of flood control, water quality control, municipal and industrial water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife, and that the Chief of Engineers be authorized to participate in the construction or reconstruction of transportation and utility facilities, particularly Interstate Highway No. 35 and adjuncts, in advance of project construction as required to preserve such areas from encroachment and avoid increased cost for relocations.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1964)

Federal	$12,893,000
Non-Federal	[1]
Total	[2] 12,893,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to bear ½ of the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement currently estimated at $300,000.
[2] Net cost to the United States is $12,593,000.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$426,000	$10,000	$436,000
Maintenance, operation, and replacements	38,000	10,000	48,000
Production loss on lands		82,000	82,000
Total	464,000	102,000	566,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			491,000
Water quality			186,000
Water supply			18,000
Fish and wildlife			29,000
Recreation			172,000
Total			896,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction, local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees), with interest, one-half of the separable costs of the Ames Dam and Reservoir allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, an amount presently estimated at $300,000, provided that greater participation under the same terms is permissible as may be agreed upon; bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, such costs presently estimated at $10,000 annually; hold and save the United States free from damages due to water rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the project; and exercise, to the full extent of their legal capability, control against removal of streamflow made available for water quality control.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Iowa: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection. However, the Bureau of the Budget concurs in the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army that water supply be deleted as a project purpose.

Remarks.—The committee notes the urgency of authorizing this project in connection with the construction of Interstate Highway No. 35 to avoid costly relocations later. The committee agrees that the extent of distant future use for water supply is speculative and that it is not necessary to designate water supply as a project purpose at this time. Adjustments to serve this purpose can be made in the future as need arises and justification is demonstrated, in accordance with standards then in effect.

Sonoma Creek, Calif.

(H. Doc. 224, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Sonoma Creek rises in the Coast Range. It flows in a generally southeasterly direction and empties into San Pablo Bay about 10 miles west of Vallejo, Calif. The creek drains an area of about 160 square miles.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolutions adopted March 16, 1954, and June 13, 1956.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project for flood control. Some levees have been constructed by local interests. Emergency channel work and levee repairs under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and Public Law 99, 84th Congress, were accomplished by the corps following the 1955 flood.

Flood problem.—Flooding in the basin is caused by intense short-period rainfall occurring within a longer duration storm. Damages are caused by inundation and bank erosion and accrue to commercial, industrial, residential, and agricultural areas.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of about 15 miles of channel, levee reconstruction and extension, provision of facilities for draining pondage, and modification of a railroad bridge and a highway bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	$9, 400, 000
Non-Federal	640, 000
Total	10, 040, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$374, 000	$25, 000	$399, 000
Maintenance and operation	0	35, 000	35, 000
Total	374, 000	60, 000	434, 000
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented			289, 000
Erosion damage prevented			35, 000
Higher land utilization			167, 000
Total			491, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including ponding, borrow, and spoil-disposal areas. Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works. Accomplish all modifications or relocations of existing utilities, roads and bridges, except railroad bridges. Maintain and operate all the works after completion. Prevent encroachment on the flood channels and ponding areas. Adjust all claims concerning water rights arising from construction and operation of the improvement. Strengthen and maintain those local levee sections on the tributaries which will be retained in effect as extensions of the Federal levees to such standards as may be required by the Chief of Engineers to assure the degree of protection contemplated for the Federal project. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Flood damages and bank erosion from recurrent floods warrant protection for the urban and agricultural areas of the basin. The committee notes that an area for ponding is to be provided by local interests. It is of concern to the committee that the assurances of local interests with regard to ponding areas remain in force over the life of the project and that encroachment upon ponding areas not be permitted.

St. Francis River, Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Ark.

(S. Doc. 57, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The St. Francis River rises in southeastern Missouri and flows in a southerly direction through eastern Arkansas. Drainage District No. 7 is located about 35 miles northwest of Memphis.

Authority.—Resolution of the Senate Committee on Public Works adopted June 27, 1960.

Existing projects.—Improvements that are part of the project for the St. Francis River Basin located partly or entirely within Drainage District No. 7 consist of levees forming the St. Francis, Big Lake and Oak Donnick Floodways; the Marked Tree siphon; and Tulot ditch. All of these works have been completed.

Flood problem.—Erosion in ditch No. 61 threatens to make a channel into the St. Francis Lake capable of passing the entire low flow of the St. Francis River through the floodway, thus bypassing the Marked Tree siphon and lower St. Francis River. This would destroy the lake resulting in the loss of highly productive habitat for sport and commercial fishery and wintering waterfowl. The increased flow in the floodway ditches adjacent to the floodway levee would accelerate erosion and possibly breach the levee. Failure of the levee would result in flooding more than 400,000 acres of highly productive agricultural land in the lower St. Francis River Basin.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of gated control structures at the entrance to the Oak Donnick Floodway; ditches in

the Oak Donnick Floodway; and deletion of the authorized paved inlet at the head of Cross Country ditch.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1964)

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Construction cost:			
Control structures	$940,000	$2,000	$942,000
Ditches	812,000	0	812,000
Total	1,752,000	2,000	1,754,000
Authorized work to be deleted: Paved inlet	−380,000		−380,000
Net increase in cost to M.R. & T. project	1,372,000	2,000	1,374,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Control structures:			
Interest and amortization	$29,800	$100	$29,900
Maintenance, operation, and replacement	1,200	1,700	2,900
Total	31,000	1,800	32,800
Ditches:			
Interest and amortization	26,500	0	26,500
Maintenance and operation	0	4,700	4,700
Total	26,500	4,700	31,200
Lower St. Francis River including new ditches			2,240,000
Annual benefits:			
Control structures:			
Fish and wildlife			62,500
Drainage			2,000
Total			64,500
Lower St. Francis River including new ditches: Damages prevented			3,974,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—Control structures, 2.0; lower St. Francis River, 1.8.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the control structures; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the controlled water levels in the St. Francis Lake area; and maintain and operate the control structures in conjunction with the Marked Tree siphon to maintain the water surface elevation in St. Francis Lake. Local interests have expressed their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Public Health Service: Favorable.

State of Arkansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau notes that the project is justified almost solely on benefits accruing from mitigation of damages to fish and wildlife with the factors necessitating the mitigation measures largely unforeseen at the time of construction. The Bureau recommends that these works be treated as part of the original project for St. Francis River District No. 7 of Poinsett County and the cost be apportioned in accordance with policies relating to that

project. Subject to consideration of its views the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report.

Remarks.—The committee notes the strong support expressed by local interests for the plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers and their willingness to cooperate therein. Construction of the works recommended is believed essential to preserve the well-being of the lower St. Francis River Basin. The improvements are well justified.

St. John River Hydroelectric Power Development, Maine

Location.—The two dams which are included in the development would be located on the upper St. John River in northern Maine at sites 289 and 300 miles above the mouth of the river.

Authority.—Report was prepared pursuant to letter from President Kennedy to the Secretary of the Interior dated May 20, 1961. In that letter the President requested the Secretary to advise him as to what changes in fuel, engineering, and financing costs might result in making the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project economically feasible, and as to the advisability of hydroelectric power development on the upper St. John River.

Flood problems.—Snowmelt, sometimes in combination with rainfall, annually produces spring floods along the St. John River. The area, being sparsely settled, has not been exposed to significant damages with the exception of Fort Kent located about 28 miles downstream of the Dickey Dam. The Fort Kent urban area has experienced seven consequential floods during a 36-year period of record. A recurrence of the flood of 1961 would cause damages of $450,000. With Dickey Dam in operation, impoundment of floodwaters would reduce discharges to well below the zero damage stage.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of the Dickey and Lincoln School projects on the upper St. John River in Maine with hydroelectric power generating facilities. The Dickey Dam would be located above the confluence of the Allagash River in order to protect recreational resources of the stream.

Estimated cost (January 1964 price level).—$227 million.

Project economics

Annual charges	$11, 550, 000
Annual benefits	21, 480, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.86.

Local cooperation.—None.

Remarks.—The committee concurs in the action of the Senate in including provisions for authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the upper St. John River in Maine. This exceptionally meritorious project, which meets all the criteria set forth in Senate Document 97, will permit the development of an important natural resource that has been too long neglected. Studies which have been made in connection with this project establish conclusively that the power can be effectively used to meet future power needs. Furthermore, the cost of power from this project is such that it should have a salutary effect as a yardstick for the highest cost power area in the Nation.

The committee notes that the recommendations contemplate construction by the Corps of Engineers and marketing of the power by the Department of the Interior. The committee believes such a

procedure to be proper and understands that all planning, construction, operation, and maintenance will be carried out by the Corps of Engineers, and all power marketing arrangements will be carried out by the Department of the Interior in essentially the same pattern that has been followed for other flood control and rivers and harbors projects under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. While that section provides for a preference in the sale of power to public bodies and cooperatives, the benefits that will flow from the project will not be confined to such preference customers. The most efficient utilization of the power potential will require that project operations be coordinated with all power suppliers of the contiguous power supply areas.

Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, N.Y.

(H. Doc. 181, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Coast of Staten Island, New York City, extending along lower New York and Raritan Bays from Fort Wadsworth at the narrows to Tottenville at the mouth of Arthur Kill.

Authority.—Section 2 of River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented; and Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—There are no existing or authorized Federal projects for hurricane protection or beach erosion control in the area.

Hurricane and beach erosion problems.—A serious erosion problem has resulted from storms of unusually severe intensity producing a reduction in the width of portions of the beach and exposing existing waterfront development to wave attack.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of the southeast shore of Staten Island from Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill for shore protection and prevention of hurricane tidal flooding by the following works: Graham Beach to Oakwood Beach, combined shore and hurricane protection consisting of 1.9 miles of beach fill and dune construction, 2.7 miles of levee, and four pumping stations; Great Kills Park, shore protection consisting of 0.9 mile of beach fill; Arbutus Lake to Seguine Point, shore protection consisting of 1.2 miles of beach fill and one stone groin; Federal participation in defraying the annual cost of periodic beach nourishment for the shore protection works in the reaches of Graham Beach to Oakwood Beach, Great Kills Park, and Arbutus Lake to Seguine Point, for a period not to exceed 10 years after the completion of the initial work in each reach, the Federal share presently estimated at 62 percent, 70 percent, and 41 percent, respectively, of such costs for the three reaches; Tottenville Beach, combined shore and hurricane protection consisting of 0.4 mile of beach fill and dunes, 0.2 mile of levee, and drainage facilities; and that the plans be considered sufficiently flexible to allow coordination with proposed highway or other developments.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1963)

Federal	$6,230,000
Non-Federal	3,231,000
Total	9,461,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$197,100	$102,200	$299,300
Maintenance		48,800	48,800
Periodic beach nourishment	64,900	96,100	161,000
Total	262,000	247,100	509,100
Annual benefits:			
Hurricane protection			545,000
Shore protection			354,000
Total			899,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8 for overall project.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including borrow areas necessary for construction of the project; accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations and relocations of buildings, streets, storm drains, utilities, and other structures made necessary by the construction; bear 34 percent of the total first cost, a sum presently estimated at $3,231,000 to consist of the items listed above and a cash contribution now estimated at $2,574,000 or, if any section is undertaken separately, the apportionment of the first cost will be as shown in the district engineer's report, with due regard to change in public ownership and other changes prior to construction, provided that the cash contribution be paid either in a lump sum prior to commencement of the entire project, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of costs to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and provide periodic nourishment during the economic life of the shore protection works as may be required to serve the intended purpose subject to Federal participation in the cost of periodic nourishment for an initial period of 10 years, as recommended herein, the non-Federal share of such costs for the 10-year period being presently estimated at 38 percent for the Graham Beach to Oakwood Beach reach, 30 percent for the Great Kills Park reach, and 59 percent for the Arbutus Lake to Seguine Point reach; maintain during the economic life of the project continued public ownership and administration for public use of the non-Federal publicly owned shores upon which the recommended Federal participation is based; adopt appropriate ordinances to provide for the preservation of the dunes; and control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers. Local interests are able and willing to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Fedederal agencies:

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee considers that authorization of the proposed improvement for hurricane protection and beach erosion control is desirable.

STRATFORD, CONN.

(H. Doc. 292, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The town of Stratford is located in Fairfield County, on the north shore of Long Island Sound, approximately 50 miles northeast of New York City.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing projects.—No hurricane protection project.

Flood problem.—About 2,400 acres within the town of Stratford are subject to hurricane tide floods. Residential, commercial, and recreational properties are subject to damages. Three severe hurricanes have struck the town within the past 24 years.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for diking around the greater part of the Great Meadows section of the town, varying in top elevation from 14 to 18 feet above mean sea level and extending about 3 miles from high ground at the Surf Avenue ramp to the Connecticut Turnpike to Oak Bluff Avenue at the western end of Lordship; a series of dikes and floodwalls along the Housatonic River, varying in top elevation from 14 to 18 feet above mean sea level, and extending about 2½ miles from high ground in the northern part of Lordship to high ground at the intersection of Broad Street and Housatonic Avenue; and appurtenant works including six highway crossing ramps, three ponding areas, four pumping stations, and five gated conduits.

Estimated cost (price level of 1962)

Federal	$4,340,000
Non-Federal	1,860,000
Total	6,200,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$136,000	$63,000	$199,000
Maintenance and operation		23,000	23,000
Total	136,000	86,000	222,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			591,000
Elimination of emergency cost			12,000
Increased land utilization			31,000
Total			634,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way including borrow and spoil-disposal areas necessary for the construction of the project at costs presently estimated at $175,000; accomplish all changes, alterations, and relocations of buildings, highways, and utilities, and modifications to sewerage and drainage facilities made necessary by the construction of the project, at costs presently estimated at $90,000; bear 30 percent of the total first cost of the

project, a sum presently estimated at $1,860,000 to consist of the items listed above and a cash contribution presently estimated at $1,595,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of costs to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and prevent any encroachment on the ponding areas which would decrease the effectiveness of the improvements and if ponding areas and capacities are impaired, promptly provide substitute storage capacity or equivalent pumping capacity. Local interests are willing to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Connecticut: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the area has suffered severe damage from hurricanes several times within the past few decades. Authorization will permit construction of necessary protective structures.

Sun River at Great Falls, Mont.

Authority.—The Sun River at Great Falls, Mont., flood control project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958.

Existing project.—The authorized plan contemplates 8 miles of levees along Sun River and on the left bank of the Missouri River near the mouth of the Sun, together with channel improvements on the Sun. No advance planning or construction have been accomplished. The project authorization contained a provision for cash contribution by local interests for land enhancement in accordance with policy at that time, amounting to 2.16 percent of the Federal construction cost.

Modification.—The proposed modification to the project would relieve local interests of the requirement for cash contribution that is based on land enhancement that would result from flood control. The amount of cash contribution is presently estimated at $50,000.

Remarks.—Under present policy with respect to land enhancement benefits, a cash contribution would not now be required under the circumstances of the Sun River project as no windfall-type benefits would accrue to limited special interests. Also, development of some of the areas subject to the land enhancement has already taken place in spite of the flood hazard. Accordingly, the committee recommends modification of the project to relieve local interests of the requirement for cash contribution based on land enhancement benefits, and the bill so provides.

Tahquitz Creek, Calif.

(H. Doc. 223, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Tahquitz Creek drains a mountainous area adjacent to Palm Springs. The creek flows through developed and undeveloped land in the southern part of the city.

Authority.—Section 5, Public Law 406, 75th Congress, approved August 28, 1937.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project on Tahquitz Creek. Local interests have constructed improvements consisting of a training dike and channel upstream from the developed area and a channel with paved side slopes through the developed area.

Flood problem.—Flash floods cause inundation and debris damage to residential and business properties and restriction of future development in Palm Springs.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a debris basin just below the mouth of Tahquitz Canyon and a concrete-lined channel along Tahquitz Creek for about 3.5 miles from the debris basin to the confluence with Palm Canyon Wash.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1962)

Federal	$3,030,000
Non-Federal	[1] 1,350,000
Total	4,380,000

[1] Includes $920,000 cash contribution.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$96,000	$44,000	$140,000
Maintenance and operation	0	25,000	25,000
Total	96,000	69,000	165,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			100,000
Increased utilization of land			110,000
Total			210,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements and rights-of-way; perform all necessary construction or relocation of highways, roads, bridges, and utilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; construct the necessary closures to integrate the proposed improvement with existing levees on Palm Canyon Wash; maintain and operate the works after completion; prevent encroachment upon the improved channel and the debris basin that would reduce their carrying capacity; contribute in cash 23.3 percent of construction cost, presently estimated at $920,000, for land enhancement benefits.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes the flood hazard along Tahquitz Creek. In addition to protecting developed areas, the project will permit use of highly desirable lands upon which development has been restricted because of the flood potential. The project is well justified and the committee recommends it be authorized in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. However, the com-

mittee considers it appropriate that the amount of cash contribution due to enhancement of land as recommended by the Chief of Engineers be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. Based on data available to the committee at this time the non-Federal cash contribution on this basis would be $508,000.

Taylors Bayou, Tex.

(H. Doc. 206, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Taylors Bayou is located in the southeast corner of Texas and it drains the segment of coastal plain between Port Arthur and Beaumont on the east and Galveston Bay on the west.

Authority.—Section 11 of the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project.—No Federal project for flood control or drainage in the watershed. Local interests have constructed improvements for drainage in the agricultural and urban areas in the upper basin and improved portions of the natural channels in the basin. Also, they have constructed a salt water barrier and navigation lock near the lower end of Taylors Bayou.

Flood problem.—A total of nearly 80,000 acres is subject to flooding during periods of intense precipitation because of inadequate outlet channels for farm drainage and for floodwater from the upper reaches in Hillebrandt Bayou in the city of Beaumont.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Enlargement of more than 40 miles of natural and artificial channels in the Taylors Bayou watershed including Hillebrandt Bayou; construction of a diversion channel via the Salt Bayou channel to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway with a salt water gate at the upper end; and construction of an adequate on-farm and group lateral drainage system.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1961)

Federal	$6,290,000
Non-Federal	[1] 12,450,000
Total	18,740,000

[1] Includes $8,870,000 for on-farm drainage improvements above the major outlet channel.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$235,600	$513,000	$748,600
Maintenance and operation		550,200	550,200
Total	235,600	1,063,200	1,298,800
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			1,492,000
Increased land use			2,434,000
Total			3,926,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.0.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; make alterations and relocations of structures and utilities; contribute in cash 6.3 percent of the construction cost of the work to be done on the Federal project, presently estimated at $421,000, or construct such additional equivalent items of work as may be agreed upon by the Federal Government and local interests, subject to final adjustment of the amount after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; prevent encroachment in the flood-carrying capacity of the improved channels and diversion channel; and construct and maintain the local drainage works required to fully and effectively utilize the improved outlet system. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to meet these requirements.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget does not believe that sufficient reason exists for crediting local interests for work accomplished by such interests prior to project authorization; and accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget recommends that the conditions of local cooperation be applied only to the new work recommended for construction. On that basis and on conditions and price levels prevailing in July 1961, the Bureau notes the estimated cost of the project would be $7,916,000 of which $3,008,000 would be allocated to flood control and $4,908,000 would be allocated to major drainage purposes. Given these conditions and current policies, local interests would then be expected to contribute the cost of lands and relocations ($458,000) for the flood control portion of the project and 50 percent ($2,454,000) of the total cost allocated to drainage purposes. This would result in the local interests bearing 36.8 percent or $2,912,000 of the total estimated first cost of the project. The Bureau also notes that the information on which the report is based is in large part over 10 years old and that no specific justification is presented for the substantial increase in benefits which is incorporated in the updating of the report by the Chief of Engineers. Accordingly, if the project is authorized, the Bureau would expect a reevaluation of the project prior to any request for funds to initiate the construction. The Bureau advises that subject to consideration of its views, there would be no objection to the submission of the report to Congress.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army concurs in the view of the Bureau of the Budget that a reevaluation of the project should be made prior to any request for funds to initiate construction. The Secretary recommends that local interests contribute 25.4 percent toward the cost of construction in lieu of 6.3 percent, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers. On this basis the estimated net cost to the United States would be $5,004,000 for construction and the estimated non-Federal cost would be $2,912,000 including $1,205,000 for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations, and a cash contribution of $1,707,000.

Remarks.—The committee notes the magnitude of the flood problem in the Taylors Bayou basin and the corrective work already done by

local interests. The committee believes that the work now recommended will comprise a valuable addition to the work already done, and that the cost of this additional work should be shared in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army.

Trinidad Dam, Colo.

(Modification of H. Doc. 325, 84th Cong.)

The report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 325, 84th Congress, on which authorization of Trinidad Dam, Colo., was based, contained a recommendation for cash contribution by local interests for prospective land enhancement benefits, in accordance with the policy existing at that time. The amount of the contribution required presently is estimated at $548,500.

Under present policy with respect to land enhancement benefits resulting from flood control reservoirs a cash contribution would not now be required under the circumstances of the Trinidad Dam project, as no windfall-type benefits would accrue to limited special interests.

The committee understands that it would be difficult for the city of Trinidad to meet the present requirement for cash contribution, because the economy of the area is in a depressed condition with a high rate of unemployment. The committee considers it proper that the conditions of local cooperation for this project be modified in accordance with present policy.

Wabash River, Ind. (Lafayette and Big Pine Reservoirs)

(S. Doc. 29, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Wabash River drains 33,100 square miles of which 11,400 are in the White River Basin. It rises in Mercer County near Celina, Ohio, flows northwesterly 67 miles to Huntington, Ind., then southwesterly to the confluence with White River and continues southwesterly 96 miles to join the Ohio River 133 miles above its mouth. The Wildcat Creek Basin is in the upper-central portion of the Wabash River Basin and lies in Tippecanoe, Carroll, Howard, Clinton, and Tipton Counties, Ind. This stream drains an area of 800 square miles and empties into the Wabash River from the left bank at mile 317, a point just upstream from Lafayette, Ind. The Big Pine Creek drains 333 square miles and joins Wabash River from the right bank, opposite Attica, Ind. This watershed is situated in the upper central portion of the Wabash Basin and lies in Warren and White Counties, Ind.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Senate Public Works Committee adopted May 9, 1949, and May 6, 1958.

Existing project.—There are no existing Corps of Engineers improvements in the Big Pine and Wildcat Creek Basins.

Flood problem.—The Wabash Basin is subject to frequent and destructive flooding. Major floods usually occur during the winter and early spring months. The flood of March–April 1913 is the maximum of record followed by those of May 1943 and January–March 1950. A recurrence of the 1913 and 1943 floods would cause damages of $18 and $24 million, respectively, in the flood plain areas downstream from the proposed dam and reservoir projects.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of the Lafayette Dam and Reservoir on Wildcat Creek and Big Pine Dam and Reservoir on Big Pine Creek in the interest of flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1962)

	Lafayette	Big Pine	Total
Federal	$28,000,000	$16,800,000	[1] $44,800,000
Non-Federal	[2]	[2]	[2]
Total	28,000,000	16,800,000	44,800,000

[1] Net cost to the United States, $41,810,000.
[2] Non-Federal interests to bear ½ of the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement for the Lafayette and Big Pine Reservoir, currently estimated at $1,410,000 and $1,580,000. respectively.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Lafayette Dam and Reservoir: Annual charges:			
Interior and amortization	843,000	43,000	886,000
Maintenance and operation	38,000	144,000	182,000
Land productivity loss	94,000		94,000
Total	975,000	187,000	1,162,000
Big Pine Dam and Reservoir: Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	472,000	48,000	520,000
Maintenance and operation	42,000	126,000	168,000
Land productivity loss	32,000		32,000
Total	546,000	174,000	720,000

	Lafayette	Big Pine
Annual benefits:		
Damages prevented	$2,042,000	$741,000
General recreation	846,000	802,000
Fish and wildlife	82,000	46,000
Total	2,970,000	1,589,000
Benefit-cost ratio	2.5	2.2

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction of the Lafayette and Big Pine Dam and Reservoir projects local interests will be required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest one-half of the separable costs of the Lafayette and Big Pine Dam and Reservoir projects allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amounts involved currently being estimated at $1,410,000 and $1,580,000, respectively; bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amount involved currently being estimated on an average annual basis at $144,000 for the Lafayette and $126,000 for the Big Pine Dam and Reservoir projects. Local interests would also be required to prevent encroachment which would reduce the flow-carrying capacities of the natural channels between the dams and the mouths of the channels at the Wabash River.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Indiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that severe flood losses frequently occur in the Wabash River Basin and there is an urgent need for flood protection improvements. The committee considers that the two additional reservoirs would augment the comprehensive plan of development of the water and related land resources of the basin. The committee also notes that there are substantial local contributions required for the recreation and fish and wildlife features of the projects.

Wabash River, Ind. and Ill. (Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Reservoirs)

(H. Doc. 202, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Wabash River Basin contains 33,100 square miles of which 319 are in western Ohio, 8,563 in eastern Illinois, and 24,218 in Indiana. The Wabash River rises near Celina, Ohio, flows northwesterly 67 miles to Huntington, Ind., thence generally west and southwest 312 miles to the confluence of the White River, its major tributary which drains 11,400 square miles, and then continues southwesterly 96 miles to join the Ohio River at about river mile 133. The Embarrass River Basin lies entirely within the State of Illinois. The Embarrass River rises in the central part of Champaign County, near Urbana, Ill., flows in a southerly direction through Douglas, Coles, Cumberland, Richland, Crawford, and Lawrence Counties to its junction with the Wabash River at about river mile 122. The Patoka River Basin lies in southwestern Indiana above the Patoka Dam site. The Patoka River rises in southeastern Orange County, near Valeen, Ind., flows westerly through Dubois, Pike, and Gibson Counties to the Indiana State line and its junction with the Wabash River at river mile 94.6, about 1 mile below the mouth of the White River. Clifty Creek is a tributary of the East Fork of the White River. It is formed in Decatur County and flows southwesterly across Decatur County and continues in that direction to its junction with the East Fork of the White River in the middle of Bartholomew County, about 3 miles south of Columbus.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives adopted April 20, 1948, and May 6, 1958, respectively.

Existing project.—Fifty-six Federal flood control projects in the Wabash River Basin have been specifically authorized for construction. Six of these are reservoirs and the remainder are local flood protection projects.

Flood problem.—The Wabash River is subject to frequent and destructive flooding. Major floods usually occur during the winter and early spring months. The flood of March–April 1913 is the maximum flood of record followed by those of May 1943 and January–

March 1950. Damages from the 1913 flood are estimated at $25 million and from the 1943 flood are estimated at $23,017,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of the Lincoln Dam and Reservoir on Embarrass River, Ill., Clifty Creek Dam and Reservoir on Clifty Creek, Ind., and Patoka Dam and Reservoir on Patoka River, Ind., for flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, water quality control, general recreation, and fish and wildlife recreation.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1963)

Project	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Lincoln	$33,000,000	(1)	$33,000,000
Clifty Creek	15,900,000	(1)	15,900,000
Patoka River	24,000,000	(1)	24,000,000
Total	72,900,000		[2] 72,900,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to bear ½ of the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement currently estimated at $2,632,000 for the Lincoln Reservoir, $1,812,000 for the Clifty Creek Reservoir and $2,937,000 for the Patoka Reservoir. Also $268,000 and $4,025,000 to be reimbursed for water supply storage in the Lincoln and Patoka Reservoirs, respectively.
[2] Net cost to the United States is $61,226,000.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Lincoln Reservoir: Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,037,000	$92,000	$1,129,000
Maintenance and operation	43,000	225,000	268,000
Total	1,080,000	317,000	1,397,000
Clifty Creek Reservoir: Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	419,000	58,000	477,000
Maintenance and operation	42,000	158,000	200,000
Total	461,000	216,000	677,000
Patoka River: Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	402,000	220,000	622,000
Maintenance and operation	38,000	263,000	301,000
Total	440,000	483,000	923,000

	Lincoln	Clifty Creek	Patoka
Annual benefits:			
Flood damages prevented	$1,890,000	$550,000	$520,000
General recreation	865,000	591,000	1,019,000
Fish and wildlife recreation	99,000	26,000	130,000
Water supply	11,000		344,000
Water quality control	44,000		219,000
Total annual benefits	2,909,000	1,167,000	2,232,000
Benefit-cost ratio	2.0	1.6	2.2

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction of the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dam and Reservoir projects local interests will be required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest one-half of the separable cost of the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dam and Reservoir projects allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the amounts involved currently being estimated at $2,632,000, $1,812,000, and $2,937,000, respectively; bear all costs of

operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amounts involved currently being estimated on an average annual basis at $225,000 for the Lincoln, $158,000 for the Clifty Creek, and $263,000 for the Patoka Dam and Reservoir projects; reimburse the allocated construction and annual operation and maintenance costs allocated to water supply storage at the Lincoln and Patoka River Reservoirs; prevent channel encroachments tending to reduce present channel capacities; hold and save the United States free from damages from water-rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the reservoirs; exercise to the full extent of their legal capability, control against removal of streamflow made available by reservoir storage for water quality control purposes; and contribute to the control of pollution of the streams subject to low-flow augmentation by adequate treatment or other methods of controlling wastes at their source.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Indiana: Favorable.
State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget advises that the last increment of flood control storage at the proposed Lincoln Reservoir is not economically justified and believes that although there may be situations which require levels of development that exceed the last economically justified increment, it does not feel that the last added increment has been fully justified in this case. Consequently, if the project is authorized and prior to any request for funds to initiate construction, the Bureau would expect a reevaluation of the flood control benefits at the Lincoln Reservoir with a view toward determining the optimum level of flood-control benefits. The Bureau notes that the Chief of Engineers has indicated his willingness to credit toward the water supply reimbursement required of the State of Indiana the cost of work performed by the State for advance engineering and design at the Patoka Reservoir. While it is not explicitly stated in the correspondence between the Chief of Engineers and the State, the Bureau of the Budget understands that current Corps and Army policy would limit such credit to the cost of work performed after authorization. The Bureau also advises that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the three proposed reservoir projects are well justified with benefit-to-cost ratios ranging from 1.6 to 2.2. These multiple-purpose reservoirs would provide needed flood protection, yield necessary water supplies, control water quality, and enhance recreation and fish and wildlife in the basin. The projects are essential units in the overall plan of development of the basin.

Walnut River, Kans.

(H. Doc. 232, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Walnut River is in southeastern Kansas; it runs generally southward and joins the Arkansas River near the Kansas-Oklahoma State line.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted October 16, 1951.

Existing project.—There are no existing or authorized Federal Reservoir projects in the basin. Local flood protection projects at Augusta and Winfield were constructed in 1936–38 by the Works Progress Administration.

Flood problem.—Major flooding occurred in 1923, 1928, 1944, 1945, 1951, and 1953. An average of one flood occurs on the main stem and major tributaries each year. More than 100,000 acres are subject to flooding. Average annual flood damages are nearly $1 million. Also, there have been droughts and extended periods of low flows, resulting in shortages of water.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan consists of three multiple-purpose reservoirs for flood control, conservation, recreation and fish and wildlife, together with local flood protection projects at El Dorado and Winfield.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963)

Federal	[1] $66,036,000
Non-Federal	770,000
Total	66,806,000

[1] Non-Federal interests to reimburse the United States amounts currently estimated at $14,131,000 for water supply and $879,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife.

Construction costs

Reservoirs:	
El Dorado	$23,300,000
Towanda	23,000,000
Douglass	18,200,000
Total reservoirs	64,500,000
Local protection works:	
El Dorado	1,795,000
Winfield	511,000
Total local protection	2,306,000
Total project	66,806,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Reservoirs:			
Interest and amortization	$2,157,500		$2,157,500
Maintenance, operation, and replacement	164,400	$91,500	255,900
Total	2,321,900	91,500	2,413,400
Local protection works:			
Interest and amortization	50,100	24,400	74,500
Maintenance, operation, and replacement	0	9,300	9,300
Total	50,100	33,700	83,800
Annual benefits:			
Reservoirs:			
Flood control			949,900
Water supply			665,300
Water quality control			447,800
Recreation and fish and wildlife			787,000
Total			2,850,000
Local protection works: Flood control			123,000

Benefit-cost ratios:

Reservoirs:	
El Dorado	1.2
Towanda	1.2
Douglass	1.2
Local protection works	1.5

Local cooperation.—For the reservoirs: Reimburse the United States for all costs allocated to water supply storage, currently estimated at $14,131,000 for construction and $48,600 annually for operation, maintenance, and replacements; bear first and annual costs associated with recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in accordance with current policy, presently estimated at $879,000 and $42,900, respectively; hold and save the United States from water rights claims; keep local people advised of project effects for flood protection. For the local protection projects: Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the projects; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make all alterations of highways, highway bridges, utilities, and related facilities occasioned by the construction works; acquire fee title to lands designated for borrow and ponding purposes and flowage easements over lands designated for ponding purposes only; prevent encroachment on the existing and improved channels.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Recommended modification of the plan of improvement by acquisition of 1,280 acres of additional land for wildlife management purposes to mitigate wildlife losses associated with El Dorado Reservoir, also fencing be provided for all lands to be used for wildlife purposes, and funds in the amount of $30,000 be furnished the Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission for initial development of wildlife habitat. The Chief of Engineers believes that reasonable effort should be made to develop an economic analysis to provide an aid to judgment as a basis for comparison of provisions for the mitigation of

fish and wildlife losses with other project values and with possible alternative offsetting measures. On the basis of available information and assuming a reasonable value of man-day use it was concluded that the mitigating measures were not justified.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Kansas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget noted that the State of Kansas has raised questions concerning the quality of water to be released from the proposed Towanda Reservoir. The Bureau expects that a review of these aspects would be made before funds are requested for initiation of construction of the Towanda project. The Bureau has no objection to submission of the proposed report to the Congress.

Remarks.—The committee believes that the Walnut River Basin is in need of development of its water resources; it notes a serious and widespread flood problem and the need for storage of water for varied purposes. It considers the plan and scope of development to be well formulated. The committee recognizes certain problems associated with Towanda Reservoir, which is an essential element in the basin plan for flood control and water quality control. It is also convinced that upstream watershed work should be expedited and developed compatibly with Towanda insofar as possible. The committee concurs in the view of the State of Kansas that no funds for construction of Towanda should be appropriated until the proposed design and operation have been approved by the State of Kansas. Also, the committee urges close intra-agency coordination in the interests of best development of the Whitewater Watershed including Towanda Reservoir and associated upstream developments.

Waurika Reservoir, Beaver Creek, Okla.

(Modification of S. Doc. 33, 88th Cong.)

Authority.—Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, approved August 12, 1958 (Public Law 85–624). The modification would provide for acquisition of fee title to certain lands for wildlife purposes which will require specific authorization by Congress.

Existing project.—The Waurika Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 1963 as a multiple-purpose reservoir for the purposes of flood control, water supply, water quality control, irrigation, recreation and fish and wildlife in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 33, 88th Congress at an estimated cost of $25,100,000.

Wildlife problem.—A study by the Fish and Wildlife Service indicated that the Waurika Reservoir provides an excellent opportunity to develop the wildlife potential of the area as part of the national wildlife refuge system.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The national wildlife refuge proposed will involve fee acquisition of about 2,100 acres of land to be used in conjunction with 11,300 acres of project land to be operated

as a national wildlife refuge where such operation does not conflict with other project purposes.

	Estimated cost, Federal
Corps of Engineers	$418,000

The land will be purchased by the Corps of Engineers. Development, operations, and maintenance, including the funding of these items, will be the responsibility of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Project economics.—The Fish and Wildlife Service considers the expenditures to be economically justified.

Comments from the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee has considered the recommendations of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Corps of Engineers for developing a national wildlife refuge in conjunction with the lands and waters of the project, and believes that the modification of the project is desirable.

Westerly, Rhode Island

(H. Doc. 85, 89th Cong.)

Location.—About 45 miles southwest of Providence on the south shore of Rhode Island.

Authority.—Public Law 71, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved June 15, 1955.

Existing project.—No hurricane protection project. There is a cooperative beach erosion project at Misquamicut State Beach consisting of widening to an average of 150 feet for 3,250 feet. This project was completed in 1959.

Flood problem.—Serious problems of hurricane tidal flooding and beach erosion exist in Westerly. Three severe hurricanes that have struck the area since 1938 caused great loss of life and crippling damages to property. Hurricane Carol, 1954, caused tidal flood damages of about $3,900,000 in the Westerly area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of improvements for hurricane tidal protection and beach erosion control for the Misquamicut area of Westerly, R.I., from Little Maschaug Pond to Weekapaug Point, in lieu of the presently authorized project, to consist of beach raising and widening to elevation 12 feet above mean sea level for approximately 3 miles of beach; low rock-faced dikes and revetment of dunes to form a backstop to elevation 16 feet above mean sea level; rock groins to stabilize the beach; gated control structure at Weekapaug Inlet; road raising, Wawaloam Drive, Weekapaug; rock-faced dike west of Misquamicut community center extending from the shore dike to high ground, including a gated culvert; and dredging in Winnapaug Pond to obtain a portion of the sandfill required for the above construction.

	Estimated cost (price level of 1963)
Federal	$3,287,000
Non-Federal	1,663,000
Total	4,950,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$127,700	$64,600	$192,300
Maintenance		77,900	77,900
Total	127,700	142,500	270,200
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			199,300
Elimination of emergency costs			5,000
Reduction of land loss			14,700
Reduction of boat damage			2,000
Increase use of beach			242,800
Winnapaug Pond recreation			52,000
Fishing from groins			19,000
Total			534,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal, pondage, and borrow areas necessary for construction of the project, and recreation facilities on Winnapaug Pond, at a cost presently estimated at $380,000; accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations and relocation of sewerage and drainage facilities, buildings, utilities, highways, and other structures made necessary by the construction; bear 33.6 percent of the total first cost, a sum presently estimated at $1,663,000 to consist of the items listed above, and a cash contribution presently estimated at $1,283,000; to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, or in installments prior to commencement of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs and values have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction of the project; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army at an annual cost estimated at $95,000 initially and $78,000 after installation of the deferred groins; assure continued public ownership of public shore and public use of private shore upon which Federal participation in beach erosion control is based, and its administration for public use during the economic life of the project; and provide and maintain suitable facilities at public beaches to support the recreational development of the beaches; assure continued public ownership and use of recreation areas upon which Federal participation in recreation is based and provide and maintain suitable appurtenant facilities to the extent necessary for realization of evaluated benefits and their administration for public use during the economic life of the project; protect against encroachment that portion of Little Maschaug Pond included within the project in order that the water areas may be available for storage of surface runoff; control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of the bathers; construct and maintain any bulkheads required for retention of dredged materials discharged to spoil-disposal areas from the initial construction; and at least annually inform the public and those affected that the improvements will not provide any substantial protection from ocean surges higher in

elevation than that which occurred in September 1938. Local interests have indicated their willingness to furnish the necessary local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Rhode Island: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The serious problems of hurricane tidal flooding and beach erosion have been noted by the committee. It considers that the proposed improvements are urgently needed.

White Oak Bayou, Tex. (Buffalo Bayou)

(H. Doc. 169, 89th Cong.)

Location.—White Oak Bayou is a tributary of Buffalo Bayou in the San Jacinto River Basin. The bayou, with a drainage area of about 113 square miles, lies within Harris County in and near the city of Houston.

Authority.—Resolution, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 20, 1948.

Existing project.—The existing Federal flood control project for Buffalo Bayou and its tributaries above the Houston turning basin provides for the construction of Barker Dam and Reservoir and Addicks Dam and Reservoir near Houston; and for rectification of the channels of Buffalo, Brays, and White Oak Bayous in Houston. The authorized channel rectification of White Oak Bayou from its mouth to channel mile 8.5 is in the preconstruction planning stage. An existing navigation project for the Houston ship channel provides for a deep-draft channel, 300 to 400 feet wide and 36 to 40 feet deep, extending from Bolivar Roads at the lower end of Galveston Bay, via the San Jacinto River and Buffalo Bayou, to the Houston turning basin, about 55 miles inland from the Gulf of Mexico.

Flood problem.—The present channel capacity of White Oak Bayou at the Burlington-Rock Island Railroad bridge is estimated at 10,000 cubic feet per second. The largest flood of record in December 1935 produced a discharge of 14,750 cubic feet per second. The average annual damages under existing conditions are estimated at $91,000 and for conditions of full development, at $113,000.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement for the 2.1-mile reach of White Oak Bayou from the Burlington-Rock Island Railroad bridge to Cole Creek would provide for enlargement and partial concrete lining of the channel to contain the runoff resulting from the occurrence of a standard project flood. The proposed plan would provide the same degree of protection to this portion of the urban area of Houston as now authorized for the Federal flood control projects for Buffalo Bayou, Brays Bayou, and the lower reach of White Oak Bayou. Damages from floods larger than the design flood would be substantially reduced. The work would include alteration of 1 highway bridge and 1 footbridge; construction of 2 new highway bridges; and relocation of 6 pipelines and sewerlines, 1 telephone conduit structure, and 22 drainage structures.

Estimated cost (December 1963 prices)

Federal	$1,800,000
Non-Federal	670,000
Total	2,470,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$57,000	$21,000	$78,000
Maintenance and operation	0	4,000	4,000
Total	57,000	25,000	82,000
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			100,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project; provide without cost to the United States all relocations and alterations of bridges, except railroad bridges, and of all buildings, structures, pipelines, sewers, and utilities made necessary by construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; establish and enforce building limit lines approved by the Chief of Engineers along the improved channel. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee views this project as a desirable extension of the flood control program in the rapidly growing metropolitan area of Houston.

Willow Creek, Oreg.

(H. Doc. 233, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Willow Creek and its tributaries drain an area of about 890 square miles within Morrow and Gilliam Counties in north-central Oregon.

Authority.—Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project on Willow Creek. The cities of Heppner, Lexington, and Ione have made channel improvements on Willow Creek. There are numerous small private irrigation diversions in the area.

Flood problem.—The city of Heppner is in a location of high potential damage from cloudburst-type flood. The flood of 1903 destroyed about one-third of the city and drowned 247 people out of a population of approximately 1,200. In addition to the flood potential, the adverse seasonal distribution of rainfall causes water resource problems relating to water quality, irrigation, and municipal and industrial water.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement provides for a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on Willow Creek below Balm Fork and immediately upstream of Heppner, accompanied by an improved channel through the city of Heppner, for flood control, irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, water quality control, and facilities for sports fishing, wildlife, and recreation. The reservoir would have a total capacity of 11,500 acre-feet.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963)

Federal	[1] $6,680,000
Non-Federal	10,000
Total	6,690,000

[1] Net cost to the United States is $4,345,000 after reimbursement by local interests of costs apportioned to them for irrigation ($2,206,000), water supply storage ($72,000), and recreation ($57,000).

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$222,100
Maintenance, operation, and replacement (Federal)	4,900
Maintenance, operation, and replacement (non-Federal))	6,100
Total	233,100
Annual benefits:	
Flood control	130,800
Water supply	2,400
Irrigation	85,900
Recreation	53,400
Water quality control	7,300
Total	279,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way and relocations for the channel through Heppner; hold and save the United States free from damages for construction, maintenance, and operation of the channel through Heppner; hold and save the United States free from water right claims; prevent encroachment on the channel downstream of the dam; repay the construction costs and operation, maintenance, and replacement costs allocated to irrigation presently estimated at $2,206,000 and $1,090, respectively; repay the costs allocated to water supply presently estimated at $72,000 for construction and a nominal amount for operation, maintenance and replacement; pay, contribute in kind, or repay one-half the separable costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement presently estimated at $57,000; administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement; and bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities presently estimated at $5,000 annually.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Favorable.

State of Oregon: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No obligation.

Remarks.—The grave flood hazard at Heppner warrants construction of this project to protect life and property.

Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Ill.

(H. Doc. 150, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The Wood River Drainage and Levee District is in southwestern Illinois along the left bank of the Mississippi River, about 15 miles upstream from St. Louis, Mo.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Senate and the House Committees on Public Works, adopted July 18 and August 20, 1957, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing project provides for protection against floods on the Mississippi River and tributary streams by construction of 22 miles of levee with appurtenant works for seepage control, closure structures for transportation routes, and pumping stations to remove blocked drainage from urban and industrial areas.

Flood problem.—Flooding still occurs on low-lying segments of agricultural and undeveloped lands within the leveed area due to interior runoff from local storms. Closure of the gravity outlets through the levee during high stages on the Mississippi River causes ponding with damages to agricultural lands, including 1,300 acres in the vicinity of Grassy Lake. About 900 acres adjacent to the hills in the northeastern part of the area are subject to flooding from the hillside runoff.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a pumping plant with collector ditches to remove impounded runoff in the vicinity of Grassy Lake.

Estimated cost (price level, July 1962)

Federal	$179,000
Non-Federal	14,000
Total	193,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$5,500	$500	$6,000
Operation, maintenance, and replacement		3,400	3,400
Loss of production		200	200
Total	5,500	4,100	9,600
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			12,200
Increased productivity			7,900
Total			20,100

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate, and prevent encroachment on improved channels or ponding areas, and if ponding areas and capacities are impaired, provide substitute storage or equivalent pumping capacity promptly without cost to the United States. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee considers the recommended work an important and necessary addition to an existing flood control project.

Yuba River Basin (Bullards Bar Project), California

(H. Doc. 180, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Yuba River rises in north-central California on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada and flows in a southwesterly direction to enter the Feather River at Marysville, Calif.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted July 23, 1956.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for flood control provides for levees along Yuba River and around the city of Marysville, and Englebright Dam for hydraulic debris retention.

Flood problem.—The Yuba River Basin has experienced numerous major floods. The 1955 flood resulted in the loss of 40 lives, evacuation of 30,000 people, inundation of dwellings and loss of livestock, causing in excess of $50 million in damages.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Federal participation in the construction cost of the new Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, in recognition of the flood control accomplishments thereof, by contributing to the Yuba County Water Agency an amount equivalent to 11.5 percent of the actual construction cost exclusive of the cost for power and recreation facilities and the expenditure of an additional amount by the Federal Government for engineering and administration of funds; the total Federal contribution not to exceed $17,700,000.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	[1] $8, 979, 000
Non-Federal	143, 431, 000
Total	152, 410, 000

[1] Consists of $8,679,000 cash contribution to the Yuba County Water Agency and $300,000 for Federal cost engineering, design, supervision, and administration of funds.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$276, 000	$4, 769, 000	$5, 045, 000
Maintenance and operations	[1] 20, 000	893, 000	913, 000
Total	296, 000	5, 662, 000	5, 958, 000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			630, 000
Power			8, 776, 000
Irrigation			1, 887, 000
Recreation			230, 000
Total			11, 523, 000

[1] Present worth of $632,000 to be paid in lump sum to Yuba County Water Agency.

Benefit-cost ratio.—Project, 1.9; flood control, 2.1.

Local cooperation.—Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Yuba County Water Agency enter into an agreement providing for operation of the

new Bullards Bar Reservoir in a manner that will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau notes that the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers have been formulated on the basis of a 3 percent interest rate. While use of the presently prescribed interest rate of 3⅛ percent would result in no appreciable change in the benefit-cost ratio, nor in the recommended Federal share of project cost, use of this current interest rate would reduce the maximum Federal share by $1 million. Consequently, the Bureau recommends that the maximum Federal contribution be set at $17,700,000.

Recommendations of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army concurs in the views of the Bureau of the Budget and recommends Federal participation in the construction cost of the project as proposed by the Chief of Engineers with the maximum Federal contribution limited to $17,700,000.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the 1955 flood in the Yuba River Basin resulted in the loss of 40 lives and caused damages in excess of $50 million. The multiple-purpose Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir to be built by the Yuba County Water Agency will provide urgently needed flood protection on the Yuba and lower Feather Rivers when operated in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of the Army. The committee believes that the proposed Federal monetary contribution to the Yuba County Water Agency and expenditure for attendant engineering, design, supervision, and administration is well justified.

Zumbro River, Minn.

(H. Doc. 246, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Zumbro River, a west-bank tributary of the Mississippi River, drains 1,402 square miles in southeastern Minnesota and enters the Mississippi River about 70 miles southeast of St. Paul, Minn.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Public Works Committee, adopted March 5, 1952.

Existing project.—There are no existing flood-control projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Zumbro River Basin.

Flood problem.—High flows on the Zumbro River cause substantial flood damages in the reach from Kellogg to the mouth. Floodflows destroy crops and damage farm buildings, machinery, fences, and local roads.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for improvement of Zumbro River, below Kellogg, Minn., for flood control by construction of setback levees with 11,000 feet on the north bank and 12,360

feet along the south bank, excavation of channel cutoffs, the upper cutoff 3,800 feet long and the lower 3,170 feet long, and protection of the riverbank with riprap.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1962)

Federal	$975,000
Non-Federal	73,000
Total	1,048,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$37,100	$2,700	$39,800
Maintenance		2,500	2,500
Total	37,100	5,200	42,300
Annual benefits: Damages prevented			54,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; contribute in cash an amount equal to 1.5 percent of the actual cost of construction, presently estimated at $15,000, necessary for widening of levees to provide for roadway, such contribution to be paid in a lump sum prior to commencement of construction, the final allocation of cost to be made after actual costs are known; maintain all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; make at their own expense any necessary alterations to utilities and highways, highway bridges and approaches; and prevent encroachments which would reduce the flood-carrying capacity of the improved Zumbro River channel and the area between the levees. Local interests are willing to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of Minnesota: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—High flows in the Zumbro River cause substantial flood damages in the reach from Kellogg to the mouth. The committee notes that these improvements will alleviate this damage.

SECTION 205

The present authorization for a Federal local flood protection at Chillicothe, Ohio, provides that construction shall be dependent upon construction and operation of four authorized upstream Federal flood control reservoirs. This section provides that construction of the works at Chillicothe may be undertaken at such time as the four reservoirs in the Federal plan are under construction. It also provides that in the event that the Mill Creek and Alum Creek reservoir units of the plan are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, that agency shall provide assurances that flood

control storage and operation thereof will be in conformity with the plan for the Scioto River basin set forth in House Document No. 587, 87th Congress. The purpose of the section is to facilitate undertaking of needed local flood protection at Chillicothe, with assurance that essential upstream flood control storage is under construction and will be operated effectively, either by the Federal Government alone, or by the Federal Government and non-Federal interests.

SECTION 206

This section authorizes a comprehensive study for development and use of the water and related resources of southeastern Michigan. The committee considers this to be a desirable study.

SECTION 207

This section authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to make surveys for flood control and related purposes in certain localities through the Nation. The bill names the specific localities.

SECTION 208

This section provides for reauthorization of the project for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Wash., by extending the date of project authority expiration. A formal request for required assurances was made to local interests on June 10, 1960. Since assurances were not furnished, authorization for the project expired on June 10, 1965, in accordance with section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, which act initially authorized the project.

Since development of the levee plan the Washington State Highway Commission has decided to occupy the same general area with its relocation of Interstate Highway 90, formerly U.S. 10. Preliminary estimates indicate that a combined plan for the highway and the levee system would produce savings for both projects and possibly increase benefits. Additional time would be provided to develop the coordinated highway-flood control plan and to permit local interests to determine their costs in connection with the revised plan. The authorization would extend this project 5 additional years to June 10, 1970.

SECTION 209

This section authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of contract numbered DA–41–443-eng-939 with Hill County, Tex., which are subject to flooding due to construction and operation of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Tex. The committee considers it equitable for the United States to do this since the present roads do not afford adequate service.

SECTION 210

The purpose of this section is to provide for conveyance to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children & Adults, Inc., all right, title, and interest of the United States in certain lands presently under lease to the society at the Old Hickory lock and dam project, Cumber-

land River, Tenn. The land is used for recreation and camping. The section provides that title to the property authorized to be conveyed to the society shall revert to the United States and that the United States shall have right of immediate entry thereon if the society shall ever cease to use the property for recreation and camping purposes.

SECTION 211

This section designates the authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, W. Va., as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

SECTION 212

This section authorizes a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Wash., by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District No. 1. The contribution would be in recognition of the flood control accomplishment of the project and would be in an amount to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by the Secretary, approved by the President, of economic justification for the amount allocated to flood control, and subject to agreement for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the contribution is based.

SECTION 213

This section authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to cooperate with the State of New York in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development of the water resources of drainage basins wholly within that State. Under State law regional boards composed of leading citizens of such basins are being established to provide leadership and insure local support for proper resource use. Six departments of the State government are participating and extending technical assistance to these boards. The State has requested that certain Federal agencies also participate in order that Federal and State plans shall be properly coordinated, and so that the basin plans shall encompass, as integral components, those projects and programs which will subsequently be carried out under Federal programs. This section authorizes Federal participation in planning only and does not authorize Federal participation in the carrying out of any plans developed as a result of this authority.

The committee feels that careful coordination of Federal, State, and local activities is desirable and that the Chief of Engineers should have authority to cooperate with the other agencies that are participating in these planning efforts. In this connection, the committee notes that the agencies of the State of New York are cooperating with the Federal agencies in the development of comprehensive plans for river basins which extend into other States.

SECTION 214

The act approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509; 16 U.S.C. 460d(1)), authorized the Chief of Engineers, when he determines such to be in the public interest, to adjust the rental or other consideration of any lease entered into prior to November 1, 1956, pro-

viding for construction and operation of commercial recreational facilities at water resource development projects under his jurisdiction. At that time it was considered that, since lessees were offered the option of a renegotiation clause in leases entered into after November 1, 1956, the renegotiation authorization should be limited to leases made prior to that date. However, renegotiation clauses have not been included in all subsequent leases. The purpose of this section is to authorize the Chief of Engineers to adjust the consideration of any lease for such purposes entered into after November 1, 1956.

SECTION 215

This section provides authorization for a survey to determine the feasibility of, and the extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes in San Francisco Bay, including San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto.

SECTION 216

The Chief of Engineers is constructing the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kans., in accordance with the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of September 3, 1954. In this connection it will be necessary to acquire and to relocate portions of the rights-of-way and facilities of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. branch line between Junction City and Concordia, Kans. A preliminary investigation indicates that improvements have been constructed by at least 11 lessees on rights-of-way of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. which will be affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project, will be required to remove their improvements. The value of such improvements is approximately $101,500.

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees where such improvements have been or will be rendered inoperative or be otherwise affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project. The fair value of such improvements would be determined either by the Secretary of the Army or by the U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas on which is conferred jurisdiction for this purpose.

The committee considers that it is equitable in this instance for the United States to reimburse such lessees and permittees for their losses.

SECTION 217

This section authorizes the Secretary of the Army to reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, Calif., to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high water. The maximum reimbursement for such work would be $3 million. The committee believes reimbursement would be in the public interest.

SECTION 218

This section would authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, to accept requests for work and services from other Federal agencies and departments, and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

The committee is aware of instances in the past where the Corps of Engineers could not perform requested work or services for other Federal agencies because of the lack of authority to contract despite the fact that it had sufficient capability and in some instances was actually performing similar work in the area.

The committee believes that it would be in the public interest that the Chief of Engineers be in a position to accept such requests from other Federal agencies and departments.

SECTION 219

This section would raise the ceiling on annual allotment for the Corps of Engineers program of flood plain information studies from $1 million to $2,500,000.

The requests by States and local governmental agencies for the information provided under this program has greatly increased. The backlog of approved applications for studies at the end of fiscal year 1965 was such that it would take nearly 4 years to accomplish them at the currently authorized rate. Appreciation of the value of planning for proper use and control of flood plain lands is growing rapidly, and it is anticipated that the backlog will continue to grow unless an increase in appropriations is authorized. The committee is convinced that the proposed change is necessary.

SECTION 220

The committee is particularly pleased to designate the Joanna Reservoir on the Salt River in Missouri as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir as a token of the esteem in which our late colleague was held.

SECTION 221

This section provides that title II may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965."

Analysis of Title III

SECTION 301

This section summarizes the project authorizations for navigation and beach erosion control works in title III. The initial table lists the projects, project document numbers, and estimated Federal costs. Pertinent information follows for each project.

NAVIGATION PROJECTS

Projects	Document No.	Federal cost of new work
Alpena Harbor, Mich	H. 151, 88th Cong	$806,000
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio	H. 269, 89th Cong	1,840,000
Bayou La Batre, Ala	H. 327, 88th Cong	262,000
Bodega Bay, Calif	H. 106, 89th Cong	853,000
Broward County, Fla	H. 91, 89th Cong	1,093,000
Burns Waterway, Ind	H. 160, 88th Cong	25,000,000
Cape Fear River, N.C	H. 252, 89th Cong	1,510,000
Cedar River Harbor, Mich	H. 248, 89th Cong	664,000
Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor	H. 143, 89th Cong	7,095,000
Chetco River, Oreg	S. 21, 89th Cong	1,308,000
Chocolate Bayou, Tex	H. 217, 89th Cong	1,254,000
Crescent City, Calif	H. 264, 89th Cong	1,980,000
East Pass Channel to Gulf of Mexico, Fla	H. 194, 88th Cong	1,151,000
Edmonds Harbor, Wash	H. 147, 88th Cong	(1)
Frankfort Harbor, Mich	S. 16, 89th Cong	237,000
Hampton Creek, Va	H. 201, 89th Cong	(1)
Hawaiian Islands (coast of) for small craft, Hawaii	H. 353, 88th Cong	4,737,000
Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii	H. 68, 89th Cong	680,000
Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii	H. 93, 89th Cong	9,928,000
Houston ship channel (Green Bayou), Tex	H. 257, 89th Cong	470,000
Indiana Harbor, Ind	H. 227, 89th Cong	96,000
Jacksonville Harbor, Fla	H. 214, 89th Cong	8,484,000
Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii	H. 75, 89th Cong	2,291,000
Lexington Harbor, Mich	H. 301, 88th Cong	570,000
Lorain Harbor, Ohio		(2)
Mermantau River, La	H. 239, 89th Cong	2,690,000
Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoals, Va	H. 187, 89th Cong	25,600,000
New York and New Jersey Channels, N.Y. and N.J	H. 108, 89th Cong	2,581,000
New York Harbor anchorages, New York	S. 17, 89th Cong	44,852,000
Oceanside Harbor, Calif	H. 76, 89th Cong	(1)
Potomac River debris removal, Maryland and Virginia	H. 286. 89th Cong	(1)
Perdido pass channel, Ala	S. 94, 88th Cong	625,000
Ponce De Leon Inlet, Fla	H. 74, 89th Cong	1,104,000
Port Orford, Oreg	S. 62, 88th Cong	696,000
Providence River and Harbor, R.I	S. 93, 88th Cong	13,900,000
Rocky River and Harbor, Ohio	H. 352, 88th Cong	235,000
Rondout Harbor, N.Y	H. 288, 89th Cong	20,000
Saginaw River, Mich	H. 240, 89th Cong	437,000
San Francisco Bay to Stockton, Calif	H. 208, 89th Cong	46,853,000
San Luis Harbor (Port San Luis), Calif	H. 148, 88th Cong	6,360,000
Savannah Harbor, Ga	H. 226, 89th and H. 263. 89th Cong.	13,669,000
Shrewsbury River, N.J	H. 274, 89th Cong	4,090,000
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg	S. 43, 89th Cong	9,000,000
Tred Avon River, Md	H. 225, 89th Cong	323,000
Trinity River, Tex	H. 276, 89th Cong	83,000,000
West Harbor, Ohio	H. 245, 88th Cong	544,000
Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Mass	H. 247, 88th Cong	12,500,000
Total navigation, 47 projects		341,388,000

BEACH EROSION PROJECTS

Atlantic City, N.J	H. 325, 88th Cong	(3)
Cliff Walk, Newport, R.I	H. 228, 89th Cong	340,000
Duval County, Fla	H. 273, 89th Cong	2,266,000
Evanston, Ill	H. 159, 89th Cong	392,000
Fort Pierce, Fla	H. 84, 89th Cong	220,000
Haleiwa Beach, Hawaii	H. 107, 89th Cong	572,000
Hunting Island Beach, S.C	H. 323, 88th Cong	319,000
Perth Amboy, N.J	H. 186, 89th Cong	82,000
Waikiki Beach, Hawaii	H. 104, 89th Cong	2,490,000
Total, beach erosion control, 9 projects		6,681,000
Grand total, 56 projects		348,069,000

[1] Maintenance only.
[2] To be determined.
[3] Beach nourishment only.

Navigation Projects

Alpena Harbor, Mich.

(H. Doc. 151, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Alpena Harbor, Mich., is on the northwest shore of Thunder Bay, a large indentation on the western shore of Lake Huron.

Authority.—Similar resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works, Senate, May 18, 1956, and by the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, June 27, 1956.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for channels varying from 15 to 21 feet deep; a turning basin opposite the Fletcher Paper Co. dock, 15 feet deep and about 3.7 acres; and a rubble mound breakwater 970 feet long on the south side of and parallel to the river entrance channel and extending from shore.

Navigation problem.—There are inadequate depths in the channel for economical operation of large modern self-unloading vessels and an appropriate turning basin for these vessels is needed.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A bay channel 24 feet deep and 200 feet wide from deep water in Thunder Bay to a point 300 feet lakeward of the Alpena Light; thence an entrance channel 23 feet deep narrowing to a width of 100 feet at a point 700 feet upstream of the light; thence a river channel 22 feet deep and 100 feet wide to the Second Avenue Bridge; a turning basin 18 feet deep, trapezoidal in shape, with a maximum width of 700 feet including the channel width and a maximum length of 900 feet along the channel line, including the removal of the existing rubble breakwater; and a breakwater paralleling the lakeward side of the new turning basin.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1962)

Federal	$695,000
Non-Federal	33,000
Total	728,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$25,300	$1,500	$26,800
Maintenance and operation	2,600		2,600
Total	27,900	1,500	29,400
Annual benefits: Transportation savings			41,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free

from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvement; provide the necessary terminal facilities at the Abitibi Corp. to accommodate the prospective commerce considered in this report; and when and where necessary dredge and maintain the areas between the Federal improvement and terminal facilities to depths commensurate with the improved Federal channel. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the navigation facilities are inadequate to permit economical operation of the large vessels using the harbor. The committee believes that in order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of 1 foot in channel depth should be provided. The estimated Federal cost is $806,000 on this basis.

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio

(H. Doc. 269, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio, is on the south shore of Lake Erie about 59 miles easterly of Cleveland, Ohio.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee Resolution 27 June 1956 and Senate Public Works Committee Resolution 18 May 1956.

Existing Projects.—Provides for an outer harbor protected by two breakwaters both generally of rubblemound construction; the removal of 250 feet of the old inner east breakwater and of such additional lengths as may be necessary; an entrance channel 29 feet deep between the existing breakwaters; a channel 28 feet deep through the outer harbor to the old inner east breakwater; thence 27 feet deep inside the inner breakwater to the New York Central Railroad Co.'s Minnesota slip and to a point 2,000 feet upstream from the mouth of Ashtabula River; an irregularly shaped turning basin 22 feet deep in the easterly portion of the outer harbor; an access channel leading southeastward from the present harbor entrance and terminating in a basin adjacent to the east outer harbor terminals, all 25 feet deep; a modified approach channel, 28 feet deep, to the New York Central Railroad Co.'s Minnesota slip at such time as the authorized conditional removal of 250 feet of the inner breakwater is accomplished; a channel 18 feet deep in Ashtabula River, from the terminus of the 27-foot channel to the upper car ferry slip; and thence 16 feet to the upstream project limit.

Navigation problem.—Present controlling depths in east outer harbor are inadequate to accommodate modern vessels desirous of using depths to be available in connecting channels and St. Lawrence Seaway.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for deepening the east outer harbor to depths of 28 feet in soft material, and 29 feet in hard material.

Estimated cost (price level, December 1964)

Federal	$1,840,000
Non-Federal	
Total	1,840,000

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$75,500
Maintenance	6,000
Total	81,500
Annual benefits: Transportation savings	125,900

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvement; and provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, depths in berthing areas adjacent to the east outer harbor piers and the access thereto commensurate with the depths provided in related project areas.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Ohio: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes the need for deepening the east outer harbor to accommodate modern vessels.

Bayou La Batre, Ala.

(H. Doc. 327, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Bayou La Batre is located on the gulf coast of Alabama about 30 miles southwest of Mobile, Ala.

Authority.—Resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committees of the Senate on May 24, 1960, and by the House of Representatives on June 30, 1960.

Existing project.—Provides for a navigation channel of 9-foot depth and 100-foot width from Mississippi Sound and up Bayou La Batre, an overall distance of about 24,000 feet.

Navigation problem.—Fully loaded fishing boats are damaged by groundings in the present channel. Deeper channels are needed also to accommodate larger more efficient commercial fishing vessels operating along the gulf coast.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Project to be modified to provide a channel 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Mississippi Sound to a point about 2,800 feet below the highway bridge at the town of Bayou La Batre, thence narrowing to 75 feet at the same depth to the bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of September 1963)

Federal	$262,000
Non-Federal	2,000
Total	264,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$10,000		$10,000
Maintenance dredging	25,000		25,000
Maintenance of navigational aids	1,000		1,000
Total	36,000		36,000
Annual benefits:			
Elimination of vessel damage			9,000
Savings to commercial fishing			12,500
Increased fish catch			17,000
Total			38,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction and subsequent maintenance; provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to comply with the provisions of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Alabama: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the channel into Bayou La Batre is unsafe and inadequate to accommodate existing navigation. The project will alleviate this undesirable situation.

Bodega Bay, California

(H. Doc. 106, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Bodega Bay is located on the Pacific coast about 58 miles north of San Francisco. Bodega Harbor is at the north end and separated from the bay by a sandspit which extends westward from the mainland toward Bodega Head.

Authority.—Resolution, House Committee on Public Works, adopted June 3, 1959.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project, completed in 1943, provides for entrance jetties 1,130 feet and 1,650 feet long; a bulkhead to retain the sandspit; an entrance channel 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide; thence a channel of the same dimensions to the town of Bodega Bay and southeasterly along the shore for a distance of 4,200 feet, with three turning basins. The total length of channel including the

turning basins is about 16,000 feet. Local interests have dredged a mooring area along the north shore of Doran Beach near the existing project channel for the accommodation of Coast Guard vessels. They have also provided terminal and moorage facilities as needed.

Navigation problem.—The channel, turning basin, and moorage areas at the town of Bodega Bay are exposed to storm waves which cause damage to vessels and piers. There is also need for additional facilities for recreational craft.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A rock and rip-rap protected earth mole extending from the shore around the innermost turning basin and paralleling the existing channel for a total distance of 4,500 feet. A channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide on the north side of Doran Beach spit.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

	Mole	Doran Beach Channel	Total
Federal	$750,000	$103,000	$853,000
Non-Federal	420,000	103,000	[1] 523,000
Total	1,170,000	206,000	1,376,000

[1] Cash contribution.

Project economics

	Mole	Doran Beach Channel	Total
Annual charges:			
Federal:			
Interest and amortization	$29,000	$4,500	$33,500
Maintenance	5,000	10,300	15,300
Total Federal	34,000	14,800	48,800
Non-Federal:			
Interest and amortization	16,000	4,000	20,000
Total annual charges	50,000	18,800	68,800
Annual benefits:			
Commercial fishing	47,000	0	47,000
Recreational boating	84,000	40,000	124,000
Total	131,000	40,000	171,000
Benefit-cost ratio	2.6	2.1	2.5

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash prior to construction 36 percent of the first cost of construction of the mole and 50 percent of the first cost of dredging the Doran Beach Channel, such contributions being presently estimated at $420,000 and $103,000, respectively. Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way. Hold and save the United States free from damages. Provide and maintain an adequate service frontage and a public landing with suitable supply facilities at each location, necessary mooring facilities for local and transient boats with adequate depths in berthing areas, utilities, access roads and parking areas, and other necessary public use shore facilities, open to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—
Department of the Interior: Favorable.
State of California: Favorable.
Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.
Remarks.—The committee notes that the project will have significant commercial benefits in addition to the recreational benefits.

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Fla.

(H. Doc. 91, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Broward County is on the lower east coast of Florida about 300 miles south of Jacksonville and about 30 miles north of Miami. Hillsboro Inlet is located in the northern part of Broward County.
Authority.—Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives on June 27, 1956; section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930; and in partial response to Public Law 71, 84th Congress.
Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project.
Beach erosion and navigation problems.—At a number of locations along the shoreline of Broward County erosion has undermined or has threatened to undermine shore-front structures. Recession of the shore is causing the loss of valuable property. Small craft incur damage and are frequently delayed because of hazardous conditions in the shallow shifting entrance channel.
Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvements for beach erosion control in Broward County, Fla., from the north county line to Hillsboro Inlet and from Port Everglades to the south county line, and a combined beach erosion control and navigation improvement of Hillsboro Inlet and the shore south thereof to Port Everglades. The beach erosion control features comprise restoration of a protective beach to a general width of 100 feet with berm elevation of 10 feet above mean low water and periodic nourishment thereof. The navigation features would provide for a channel 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Intracoastal Waterway to a point 1,500 feet oceanward in Hillsboro Inlet, thence 10 feet deep and 150 feet wide to deep water in the Atlantic Ocean; jetties on the north and south sides of the ocean entrance; and a permanently based floating dredge to maintain the navigation channel and transfer sand across the inlet with the provision that the dredge be replaced by a trestle-mounted sand-transfer plant if experience proves the dredge to be unsatisfactory.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1962)

Federal	$1,093,000
Non-Federal	4,485,000
Total	5,578,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$41,900	$170,200	$212,100
Maintenance and operation	36,700	43,600	80,300
Periodic nourishment	49,400	251,600	301,000
Total	128,000	465,400	593,400
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating	----------	----------	85,000
Beach restoration	----------	----------	1,690,800
Total	----------	----------	1,775,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.0.

Local cooperation.—Contribute toward the first cost of providing the recommended improvements for navigation and beach erosion control in the amount of the following percentages (exclusive of navigation aids, lands, easements, rights-of-way, and preproject expenditures by local interests at Pompano Beach) in such manner as may be acceptable to the Chief of Engineers for construction to be performed by the Corps of Engineers, the final amount to be ascertained after actual costs have been determined: (1) 90.5 percent of the first cost of the recommended beach erosion restoration in the reach between the north county line and Hillsboro Inlet, now estimated at $833,000; (2) 90 percent of the first cost allocated to beach erosion control and 50 percent of the first cost allocated to navigation in the combined beach erosion-navigation project between Hillsboro Inlet and Port Everglades, estimated at $2,123,000 and $337,000, respectively; and (3) 72.4 percent of the first cost of the recommended beach restoration in the reach between Port Everglades and the south county line, now estimated at $1,115,000; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the projects and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, and suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil not used for beach nourishment, and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; obtain approval of the Chief of Engineers, prior to commencement of work on a project, of detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecution of work on the project, if local interests desire to construct the beach erosion features; furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that during the economic life of the project they will: (1) Hold and save the United States free from damages that may be attributed to the construction and maintenance of the projects; (2) provide and maintain without cost to the United States an adequate public landing or wharf at Hillsboro Inlet with provisions for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, available to all on equal terms; (3) establish a properly constituted and competent nonprofit public body empowered to cooperate financially and to provide and operate essential local facilities for navigation at Hillsboro Inlet open to all on equal terms; (4) control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers; (5) maintain continued ownership of the publicly owned shores upon

which the amount of Federal participation is based and their administration for public use; (6) maintain all project works except the jetties at Hillsboro Inlet and the aids to navigation there, perform periodic beach nourishment, operate, and maintain the floating dredge for its period of use, maintain the navigation channel at Hillsboro Inlet for the same period, and operate and maintain the sand transfer plant should it be constructed, at which time maintenance of the navigation channel would revert to the United States, subject to Federal participation as recommended herein. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee recognizes the need for correction of the serious shore erosion problem which threatens eventual destruction of highly desirable recreational areas and improved private property in Broward County. The committee notes that the entrance channel in Hillsboro Inlet is unsafe and inadequate to accommodate the recreational craft based in the area and that the project is needed to correct these deficiencies.

Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.

(H. Doc. 160, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The site of the proposed harbor is in the vicinity of Burns Ditch on the south shore of Lake Michigan in Porter County, Ind., about 9 miles east of Gary Harbor, Ind.

Authority.—Similar resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on May 18 and June 27, 1956, respectively. It is also in response to a resolution of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives adopted on March 15, 1949.

Existing project.—There is no existing project for a harbor on the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan at or in the vicinity of the mouth of Burns Ditch.

Navigation problem.—Various interests in the State of Indiana desire a new public harbor on the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Burns Ditch.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The Chief of Engineers recommends improvements for a north breakwater 4,050 feet long; a west breakwater 1,330 feet long; an east breakwater 1,340 feet long; an approach channel 30 feet deep and 400 feet wide, extending from deep water in Lake Michigan to the north end of the east breakwater; an entrance channel 28 feet deep and 800 feet wide, from the end of the approach channel to the west breakwater; and an outer harbor area of 225 acres, 27 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1961)

Federal	$25,000,000
Non-Federal	0
Total	25,000,000

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$1,007,700
Maintenance	100,000
Maintenance navigation aids	300
Total	1,108,000
Annual benefits:	
Elimination of need for private harbor	930,000
Transportation savings	896,000
Total	1,826,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damage due to the construction and maintenance of the project, including damages resulting from any shore erosion that may occur; reimburse the United States for all excess costs for dredging should this work be done by other than hydraulic methods; provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas; construct a fully integrated steel plant; and construct adequate east- and west-shore connections having lengths of 1,820 and 2,500 feet, respectively. The construction of these shore connections is to be done either in advance of or concurrently with construction of the breakwaters by the United States. Representatives of the State of Indiana have stated that formal assurances covering the items of local cooperation will be furnished when required.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Indiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress subject to the following comment: "The Bureau of the Budget recommends authorization of the Burns Waterway Harbor, provided that prior to expenditure of funds for construction, local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the items of local cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers will be complied with and additionally that:

"1. Arrangements and schedules for providing public terminals and transfer facilities are adequate to support the traffic on which project benefits are based and such facilities will be financed on a self-liquidating basis.

"2. Water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the harbor.

"3. There will be construction of two integrated steel mills on a schedule generally consistent with the completion of the harbor—or of one integrated steel mill if a detailed study by the Chief of Engineers of traffic related to the other mill, and to other transshipped commodities, clearly support economic justification of the project. The study should be supplemented by an appraisal in collaboration with other interested Federal agencies of prospective coal shipments through the proposed harbor with appropriate consideration of other possible alternative modes of coal movement such as barge-to-lake vessel transshipment."

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary concurs in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget and recommends further that the State of Indiana furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent possible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreation areas in the general vicinity of the harbor.

Remarks.—The language used in authorizing this project will permit it to be carried out either as Federal project, as recommended in House Document 160, 88th Congress, or as a project of the State of Indiana. Should the State elect to provide a public harbor at the Burns Waterway site within a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army may arrange with the State of Indiana for a Federal monetary contribution toward the construction cost of the harbor. This contribution is subject to the seven conditions specifically set forth in the bill and cannot be made until approved by the President and considered by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives.

S. 2300 as passed by the Senate contained a proviso under which any funds appropriated for the construction of this project could not be used "until such time as the Indiana dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by Act of Congress." The committee considers that the inclusion in a rivers and harbors act of language bearing upon a legislative proposal over which this committee has no jurisdiction is in conflict with accepted legislative procedure. Accordingly the committee has substituted for the proviso included in the Senate version of the bill, language which makes it clear that authorization of the project shall not adversely affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of an Indiana dunes national lakeshore.

Cape Fear River, Above Wilmington, N.C.

(H. Doc. 252, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Cape Fear River is formed in central North Carolina by the confluence of the Deep and Haw Rivers. It flows generally southeast 198 miles and empties into the Atlantic Ocean near Cape Fear, 28 miles below Wilmington.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives adopted March 29 and August 15, 1961, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing project provides for a dredged channel from Wilmington to Navassa, 25 feet deep and generally 200 feet wide, with a cutoff of the same depth across Horseshoe Bend,

200 feet wide, and a turning basin, approximately 550 feet long and 400 feet in average width at its head; for a navigable depth of 8 feet at low water from Navassa to Fayetteville, 115 miles above Wilmington, by the construction of three locks and dams and by dredging of river shoals between Navassa and Fayetteville; and for construction of recreational facilities at the three locks and dams.

Navigation problem.—The present depths, widths, and alinement of the river do not permit the passage of oceangoing vessels above Navassa. The channel dimensions and river alinement above Navassa limit barge traffic to single tows of about 7-foot drafts. Barges frequently strike the riverbanks in the tight bends in the lower portion of the river.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification of the existing project for Cape Fear River, N.C., above Wilmington to provide a channel 12 feet deep and 140 feet wide from Navassa, about 4 miles above Wilmington, to mileboard 30 at Acme, with five channel cutoffs, 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide, to eliminate sharp bends in the river between these points.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1964)

Federal	$1, 510, 000
Non-Federal	108, 000
Total	1, 618, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$60, 100	$4, 300	$64, 400
Maintenance and operation	83, 000	2, 900	85, 900
Total	143, 100	7, 200	150, 300
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings for prospective commerce			231, 300
Reduced operating costs			20, 200
Total			251, 500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.7.

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction local interests will be required to provide without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation, if required, upon request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor, or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages to wharves, piers, and buildings due to construction and maintenance of the project; provide firm assurances that riverside terminal and transfer facilities will be constructed at the upper limit of the recommended project to permit transfer of commodities from or to plants and barges; provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project channel areas; and accomplish, without cost to the

United States, such alterations, if any, as required in sewer, water supply, drainage, electrical powerlines, and other utility facilities, as well as their maintenance. Responsible local interests have indicated a willingness to cooperate in the improvement.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of North Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The proposed channel improvement would increase the safety and efficiency of existing and prospective barge transportation on the lower Cape Fear River.

Cedar River Harbor, Mich.

(H. Doc. 248, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Cedar River Harbor is at the mouth of Cedar River on the west shore of Green Bay about 68 miles north of the city of Green Bay, Wis.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution July 20, 1959, and House Public Works Committee resolution August 14, 1959.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for dredging an entrance channel 14 feet deep and constructing two parallel piers extending lakeward from the mouth of Cedar River. Construction and dredging were carried on intermittently until 1886, when the piers were completed to lengths of 750 feet for the east pier and 300 feet for the west pier. The channel was dredged to a depth of 13 feet at a width of 50 feet.

Navigation problem.—Deterioration of east pier and insufficient channel depths restrict local commercial fishing boats. Recreational boat traffic is negligible due to navigation conditions and lack of facilities.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for two parallel entrance piers including a new east rubblemound pier, approximately 2,100 feet long with a cellular steel pile pierhead, navigation light base, and sport fishing walkway; an entrance channel 100 feet wide and 10 feet deep from that depth in Green Bay to the mouth of Cedar River; an inner channel in Cedar River 1,400 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 8 feet deep upstream to a point about 150 feet below the State Route 35 bridge; and a turning basin 150 feet wide near the upstream end of the inner bridge channel.

Estimated cost (price level of April 1964)

Federal	$664,000
Non-Federal	121,000
Total	785,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$26,500	$4,850	$31,400
Maintenance and operation [1]	8,000		8,000
Total	34,550	4,850	39,400
Annual benefits:			
Commercial fishing			37,800
Recreational navigation			15,200
Harbor of refuge			1,000
Recreational fishing			12,000
Total			66,000

[1] Includes $300 for navigation aids.

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.7.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 15 percent of the first cost of the new navigation facilities and 50 percent of the first cost of structural modifications necessary to provide for a sport fishing walkway on top of the new east pier, the total of such contributions being presently estimated at $121,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil; and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the project; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities, including an adequate public landing or wharf with provision for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, and a parking lot with adequate sanitary facilities, available to all on equal terms and including the dredging of berthing areas to depths commensurate with the related project depths; and reserve anchorage spaces and mooring facilities adequate for the accommodation of transient craft. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee believes the project is necessary in the interest of commerical and recreational fishing, and as a harbor of refuge.

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Va.

(H. Doc. 143, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The channel to Newport News is at the southern end of Chesapeake Bay in the western section of Hampton Roads, Va.

Authority.—Two resolutions adopted July 31, 1957, by the House Public Works Committee.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for Norfolk Harbor provides for a main channel 40 feet deep, 1,500 feet wide from deep water in Hampton Roads to a point just south of the Hampton Roads Army terminals; thence 40 feet deep and 750 feet wide to the mouth of Southern Branch, thence 40 feet deep and 450 feet wide up this branch to the Norfolk & Western Belt Line Railroad bridge, a total distance of 13.2 miles, including an approach and turning area to the same depth opposite the Norfolk Naval Shipyard; thence 35 feet deep and 375 to 250 feet wide for 4.1 miles to a turning basin of the same depth; for subsidiary channels in Eastern and Western Branches and Scotts Creek; anchorage areas on the west side of the 40-foot channel opposite Lamberts Point and south of Craney Island aggregating 173 acres, consisting of: one anchorage space 1,500 feet square and 38 feet deep; one anchorage space 1,500 feet square and 35 feet deep; and one anchorage space 1,000 feet wide, 3,000 feet long, and 20 feet deep; another anchorage of 45 acres, 12 feet deep, near Pinners Point; and a disposal area of about 2,500 acres, adjacent to and north of Craney Island, enclosed by levees, three sluiceways in the westerly levee, an access road, facilities for sump rehandling of hopper-dredged material, an anchorage for the sump rehandler, an approach area 300 by 3,600 feet, 30 feet deep, connecting the anchorage with Norfolk Harbor 40-foot channel, and facilities for contract rehandling of bucket dredging consisting of a rehandling basin and provided with approach-exit channels 200 feet wide and 18 feet deep to Norfolk Harbor 40-foot channel.

Navigation problem.—There are no improved anchorages in Hampton Roads capable of accommodating large, deep-draft vessels without encroachment on the adjacent project channels, and movement of large vessels in the 600-foot channel to Newport News is hazardous.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for the following: The existing project for channel to Newport News, Va., be modified to provide for (1) an increase in the project width of channel from 600 to 800 feet and to a project depth of 40 feet, and (2) two deep-draft anchorage berths, in anchorage G opposite Newport News, to a depth of 40 feet over a 1,200-foot swinging radius, and with suitable flared approach and exit areas thereto; at an estimated cost to the United States of $4,122,000 for construction, and $77,900 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required; and the existing project for Norfolk Harbor, Va., be modified to provide two deep-draft anchorage berths in anchorages D and H opposite Sewells Point, Norfolk, to a depth of 40 feet over a 1,200-foot swinging radius, and with suitable flared approach and exit areas thereto; at an estimated cost to the United States of $2,973,000 for construction, and $59,300 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	$7,095,000
Non-Federal	
Total	7,095,000

Project economics (all Federal)

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	393,400
Maintenance	137,200
Total	530,600
Annual benefits:	
Reduced anchorage costs	444,000
Reduction in vessel travel time	150,000
Total	594,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.1.

Local cooperation.—No additional requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Remarks.—The committee notes the lack of adequately improved anchorages and the attendant hazards to shipping resulting from encroachment on project channels. The improvement will correct this situation.

Chetco River, Oreg.

(S. Doc. 21, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Chetco River discharges into Chetco Cove on the Pacific Ocean about 4 miles northwest of the Oregon-California boundary.

Authority.—Senate Committee on Public Works Resolution adopted April 28, 1958.

Existing project.—The existing Federal navigation project provides for a north jetty 850 feet long, a south jetty 1,550 feet long, and dredging to stabilize the channel through the bar at the mouth of the river. Local interests have constructed a small-boat basin along the east bank of the river and a wharf.

Navigation problem.—The existing entrance channel restricts the safe passage of lumber and commercial fishing boats to high tides and daylight hours. The small-boat basin provided by local interests is congested and lacks adequate space for turning and maneuvering of commercial fishing boats.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for an entrance channel 120 feet wide and 14 feet deep; a 450-foot extension of the north jetty; a barge turning basin 250 feet wide, 650 feet long, and 14 feet deep; a protective dike 1,800 feet long; and an access channel to the small-boat basin 100 feet wide and 12 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964)

Federal	$1,308,000
Non-Federal	27,000
Total	1,335,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges			
Interest and amortization	$51,400	$1,100	$52,500
Maintenance and operation	25,000		25,000
Maintenance navigation aids	1,000		1,000
Total	77,400	1,100	78,500
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings			134,500
Reduction of barge damages			6,000
Commercial fishing			138,400
Recreational boating			9,500
Harbor of refuge			5,000
Total			293,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.7.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 6.5 percent of the first cost of the small-boat access channel and that portion of the dike thereto, such contribution, presently estimated at $9,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction; provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain depths in berthing and mooring areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with project depths; provide and maintain an adequate service frontage, launching ramp, and a public landing with suitable facilities, open to all on equal terms; and accomplish alterations as required in sewer, water supply, drainage, and other utility facilities, as well as their maintenance. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Oregon: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The improvements are needed to relieve congestion in the small-boat basin and permit unrestricted passage of commercial craft through the entrance channel.

Chocolate Bayou, Tex.

(H. Doc. 217, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Chocolate Bayou is in southeastern Texas, between the Brazos River and Galveston Bay. The bayou rises about 20 miles southwest of Houston, Tex., flows southeasterly across Brazoria County and empties into Chocolate Bay. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide crosses Chocolate Bay about 26 miles west of Galveston, Tex., and 17 miles east of Freeport, Tex.

Authority.—Resolutions of Senate and House Public Works Committees adopted June 30, 1960.

Existing project.—The authorized Chocolate Bayou project provides for a channel 4 feet deep and 100 feet wide extending from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway through Chocolate Bay to the 4-foot depth in Chocolate Bayou. In 1962, the Monsanto Chemical Co. dredged a

channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway 8.2 miles to a basin at their new plant on Chocolate Bayou.

Navigation problem.—There is a need for enlargement of the existing locally dredged channel and extension as necessary to afford the Chocolate Bayou area the same type accommodations for barge service as are available on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. In connection therewith there is a need for a barrier to mitigate damages from salt water intrusion.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement provides for a channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide extending from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway through Chocolate Bay and Chocolate Bayou to project channel mile 8.2; thence 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide to a turning basin 9 feet deep and 600 feet square near channel mile 13.2; a salt water barrier in Chocolate Bayou about 3.7 miles upstream from the turning basin.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964)

Federal	$1,254,000
Non-Federal	351,000
Total	1,605,000

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Federal	$63,600
Non-Federal	13,400
Total	77,000
Annual benefits:	
Transportation savings	$220,000
Reduction in navigation hazards	30,000
Prevention of salt water intrusion	9,000
Total	259,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.4.

Local cooperation—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the improvements and for aids to navigation upon request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required to the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvements; provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; accomplish without cost to the United States all alterations of pipelines, powerlines, utility lines, cables, and highway facilities, when and as required for construction of the project; assume all obligations of ownership, operation, and maintenance of the salt water barrier and appurtenances upon its completion. Local interests have indicated their willingness to comply.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: No objection.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget notes that the project in the lower reach would initially serve only the Monsanto Chemical Co. and in the upper reach would, at least initially, benefit only the Matagorda Shell Co. and further that it is not clear just how soon additional shippers would benefit from the modified channel. The Bureau believes that in addition to the conditions of local cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers, and in accord with established policy concerning single-users, some provision for special cost sharing should be required. A reasonable basis would be payment by local interests, annually until such time as multiple use of the channel actually occurs, of 50 percent of the annual charges for interest and amortization of the Federal first cost of the facilities involved. Subject to consideration of the recommendation, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army concurs with the views of the Bureau of the Budget on the single-beneficiary question and recommends that the authorization, in addition to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers, require a finding by the Secretary of the Army as to appropriate single-beneficiary contributions, if any, prior to appropriation of construction funds.

Remarks.—The committee views this project as an orderly progressive development of Chocolate Bayou, based on work begun by local interests, and necessary to meet growing needs of commercial navigation. The committee is satisfied that opportunities and prospects for substantial use of the project by others than Monsanto Chemical Co. and Matagorda Shell Co. warrant its undertaking in the interest of general navigation. The committee considers that no special benefits would accrue and the local cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers is appropriate, without necessity for a subsequent finding by the Secretary of the Army.

Crescent City Harbor, Calif.

(H. Doc. 264, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Crescent City Harbor is located on the northern coast of California about 280 miles north of San Francisco and about 17 miles south of the Oregon boundary.

Authority.—House Committee on Public Works resolution adopted July 31, 1957.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for an outer and inner breakwater; a rubblemound sand barrier; an outer basin, 1,800 feet by 1,400 feet, maintained to a depth of 20 feet; and maintenance dredging in the vicinity of the seaward end of the sand barrier.

Navigation.—Waves and surge cause mooring and loading problems resulting in lost vessel time and damages to vessels and harbor facilities.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification of the existing project to provide for a T-shaped basin extending from deep water, generally 20 feet deep, about 1,500 feet long with a stem 1,000 feet long; and a 300-foot extension of the inner harbor breakwater.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964)

Federal	$1, 980, 000
Non-Federal	60, 000
Total	2, 040, 000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$80, 000	$2, 200	$82, 200
Maintenance and operation	25, 000	1, 000	26, 000
Maintenance navigational aids	2, 000	0	2, 000
Total	107, 000	3, 200	110, 200
Annual benefits:			
Reduced vessel damage			74, 000
Reduced lost vessel time			5, 000
Transportation savings			234, 000
Total			313, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.8.

Local cooperation.—Provide and maintain without cost to the United States a 50-foot wide berthing area or strip between Citizens Dock and the limits of the project basin at depths commensurate with those provided in the basin by the United States; provide and maintain without cost to the United States a 50-foot wide berthing area or strip adjacent to the Oil Terminals Co. facilities at depths commensurate with those provided in the basin by the United States; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including spoil disposal areas and diking therefor, required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for construction and maintenance of aids to navigation, upon the request of the Chief of Engineers; and hold and save the United States free from property damage to wharves, buildings, and pipelines that may result from the construction and maintenance of the project.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Deepening the inner harbor will result in the more economical use of the harbor by existing and prospective commercial traffic and the breakwater will reduce damages to vessels and delays in their operation.

East Pass Channel From the Gulf of Mexico Into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.

(H. Doc. 194, 88th Cong.)

Location.—On the northwest Florida coast about midway between Pensacola and Panama City.

Authority.—Similar resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and House of Representative on January 15 and May 19, 1960, respectively.

Existing project.—Provides for maintenance of a channel 12 feet deep, 180 feet wide, and about 3 miles long from Choctawhatchee Bay

into the Gulf of Mexico, and maintenance of a channel 6 feet deep, 100 feet wide, and about 2,000 feet long from East Pass into Old Pass Lagoon.

Navigation problem.—The pass is not deep enough to enable safe navigation, and shoals rapidly. Wave action often prevents navigation through the pass. Numerous accidents and loss of life have occurred because of present navigation conditions.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification of existing project to provide for relocation of the entrance channel from the Gulf of Mexico to a more central position in the inlet and stabilization thereof with twin jetties extending to the seaward end of the channel.

Estimated cost (price level of March 1963)

Federal	$1,151,000
Non-Federal	493,000
Total	1,644,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$45,100	$21,100	$66,200
Maintenance	14,400		14,400
Total	59,500	21,100	80,600
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating			85,000
Commercial fishing			5,000
National defense			48,200
Harbor of refuge			20,000
Total			158,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.0.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 30 percent of the first cost of construction, such contribution presently estimated at $493,000; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon request of the Chief of Engineers, including spoil disposal areas necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor, or the cost of such works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance thereof. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee recognizes the need for the recommended improvements which would provide for a stable, protected channel for use by the commercial fishing, recreation, and Defense Department vessels based in the area.

Edmonds Harbor, Wash.

(H. Doc. 147, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Edmonds Harbor is located on the easterly shore of Puget Sound about 9 miles north of Seattle, Wash.

Authority.—Resolutions, Senate and House Committees on Public Works, adopted November 24, 1958, and June 3, 1959, respectively.

Existing project.—There is no Federal navigation project at this locality. In April 1962 local interests constructed a small boat harbor which provides for a mooring basin, two breakwaters, and an entrance channel. Shore facilities have been provided for the small boat harbor, ferry, barge and other terminals.

Navigation problem.—Local interests desire Federal maintenance of the breakwaters and entrance channel.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Federal maintenance of the breakwater and entrance channel at an estimated annual cost of $5,000.

Estimated cost (if constructed as a Federal project)

Federal	$229,100
Non-Federal	185,400
Total	414,500

Project economics (if constructed as Federal project)

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$8,300	$10,200	$18,500
Maintenance and operation	5,000	0	5,000
Total	13,300	10,200	23,500
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating	----------	----------	52,000
Commercial transportation savings	----------	----------	8,500
Land enhancement	----------	----------	800
Total	----------	----------	61,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.6.

Local cooperation.—Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way including spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain planned depths in the interior basin and the necessary mooring facilities and utilities, including a public landing with suitable supply facilities open to all on equal terms; regulate the use, growth, and free development of all necessary moorage facilities with the understanding that said facilities will open to all on equal terms.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Washington: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the harbor will adequately serve locally owned recreational craft, U.S. Coast Guard vessels, and commercial fishing boats, and considers Federal maintenance is appropriate.

Frankfort Harbor, Mich.

(S. Doc. 16, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Frankfort Harbor is on the east shore of Lake Michigan, about 204 miles northeasterly of Chicago, Ill.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, adopted September 18, 1957.

Existing projects.—The Federal project, completed in 1939, consists of two breakwaters, 450 feet apart at the outer ends, the north breakwater being 1,972 feet long and the south breakwater, 2,588 feet long; an outer basin inside the breakwaters, 20 feet deep, 800 feet wide near the entrance, 600 feet wide at the inner end, and about one-fourth mile long; a channel between piers 18 feet deep and approximately 1,000 feet long connecting the outer basin and Lake Betsie; and an interior basin, approximately 800 feet wide, 1,200 feet long, and 18 feet deep, dredged to within 50 feet of existing structures in that area in Lake Betsie west of the east boundary of Fifth Street extended, of the city of Frankfort.

Navigation problem.—Existing depths in the approach and entrance channels are not sufficient to permit the larger lake tankers to enter fully loaded. Car ferries have run aground east of the dredged basin during periods of adverse ice and wind conditions, and recreational craft have insufficient anchorage and turning area near the public dock.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Deepen the approach and entrance channels to a depth of 24 feet from deep water in Lake Michigan to a point 500 feet landward of the opening between the breakwaters, over the entire width outside the breakwaters and to a maximum width of 500 feet inside the breakwaters; thence to a depth of 23 feet through the inner portion of the outer basin to the outer end of the north pier, over widths decreasing from 500 feet to 160 feet; and thence to a depth of 22 feet between the piers to the inner basin in Lake Betsie; extend the interior basin 350 feet in an easterly direction at a depth of 18 feet to provide an overall basin length of about 1,550 feet; and provide a recreational craft anchorage area 10 feet deep and 300 feet wide, extending 600 feet eastward of the proposed east limit of the interior basin, with its north side in line with the north limit of the basin.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1963)

Federal	$237,000
Non-Federal	31,000
Total	268,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$9,200	$1,200	$10,400
Maintenance	5,000	0	5,000
Total	14,200	1,200	15,400
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings	----------	----------	12,350
Recreational boating	----------	----------	10,400
Total	----------	----------	22,750

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of the first cost of construction of the recreational craft anchorage area, such contribution being presently estimated at $31,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the improvements upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and subsequent maintenance of the improvements; maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and a public landing for local and transient craft, open to all on equal terms, with depths commensurate with the depth of the Federal anchorage area; reserve mooring facilities and space within the anchorage area adequate for the accommodation of transient craft; and construct the necessary terminal facilities to accommodate the prospective fuel oil commerce. Local interests are willing and able to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that existing channel depths are not sufficient for economic operation of the larger lake tankers and the basin is inadequate for recreational craft and rail-car ferries. The improvement will correct these deficiencies.

Hampton Creek, Va.

(H. Doc. 201, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Hampton Creek is a tidal estuary on the north side of Hampton Roads, Va., and 2 miles west of Chesapeake Bay.

Authority.—Resolution by the House Public Works Committee adopted April 5, 1949.

Existing project.—A channel 12 feet deep across Hampton Flats and up the creek to the Queen Street Bridge, a distance of about 2 miles, over a width of 200 feet in the outer portion and 150 feet in the creek; and a channel 12 feet deep and 80 to 100 feet wide for 0.6 of a mile in Herberts Creek.

Navigation problem.—Accelerated development of shore areas since adoption of the project has made it impossible for local interests to furnish reasonable shore disposal areas for dredge spoil.

Recommended plan of improvement.—That the existing project for Hampton Creek, Va., be modified to delete the requirement that local interests furnish, free of cost to the United States, suitable areas for disposal of dredged material from the project.

Estimated cost.—Maintenance only.

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Maintenance and operation	$31,300
Maintenance of navigational aids	300
Total	31,600
Annual benefits:	
Transportation savings	139,000
Harbor of refuge	1,000
Total	140,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.4.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from claims for damages. Local interests are willing to comply with the requirement of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Commonwealth of Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau states that with respect to the recommendation for deletion of the requirement that local interests furnish spoil disposal areas, it believes that it is possible to establish an arrangement more nearly in keeping with the intent of the original authorization and yet equitable to both local interests and the Federal Government. The Bureau recommends that local interests participate in the cost of spoil disposal by contributing in cash the capital investment increment of the cost of spoil disposal in the Craney Island disposal area. It states that this cost is currently 9 cents per cubic yard and the cost to local interests would be $27,260 for the initial rehabilitation and $810 per year for annual maintenance over the remaining life of the project.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary of the Army agrees with the views of the Bureau of the Budget.

Remarks.—The committee notes the lack of suitable spoil disposal areas in the proximity of this project and that spoil from maintenance of other Federal navigation projects in the general vicinity is being disposed of on the Federal Craney Island facility without cost to local interests. The committee considers the local cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers to be appropriate.

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, Harbors for Light-Draft Vessels

(H. Doc. 353, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The harbors are located at various communities on the islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, and Hawaii.

Authority.—River and Harbor Act of May 17, 1950.

Existing project.—There are no Federal navigation improvements in Hawaii specifically for the use of small boats. There are seven federally improved commercial harbors, six of which are 35 feet deep and one 23 feet deep. The harbors with 35-foot depth are at Port Allen and Nawiliwili Harbors on Kauai, Honolulu Harbor on Oahu, Kahului Harbor on Maui, and Hilo and Kawaihae Harbors on Hawaii; the 23-foot harbor is at Kaunakakai on Molokai. There are 20

harbors for small boats along the shores of the islands, 15 owned by the State, and 5 by private interests.

Navigation problem.—There is need for additional protected harbors at various localities in the Hawaiian Islands for existing and future recreational and commercial fishing craft.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for eight small-boat harbors at the following locations: Hanalei Bay, Kauai; Waianae, Oahu; Heeia-Kea, Oahu; Kailua, Oahu; Maunalua Bay, Oahu; Lahaina, Maui; Hana Maui, and Reeds Bay, Hawaii.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1962)

Location	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Hanalei Bay, Kaui	$347,000	$530,000	$877,000
Waianae, Oahu	933,000	934,000	1,867,000
Heeia-Kea, Oahu	409,000	437,000	846,000
Kailua, Oahu	244,000	485,000	729,000
Maunalua Bay, Oahu	513,000	657,000	1,170,000
Lahaina, Maui	364,000	344,000	708,000
Hana, Maui	1,679,000	189,000	1,868,000
Reeds Bay, Hawaii	248,000	274,000	522,000
Total	4,737,000	3,850,000	8,587,000

Project economics and benefit-cost ratio

Location	Annual charges	Annual benefits	Benefit-cost ratio
Hanalei Bay, Kaui	$36,500	$47,100	1.3
Waianae, Oahu	85,000	96,100	1.1
Heeia-Kea, Oahu	38,100	211,300	5.5
Kailua, Oahu	34,600	52,700	1.5
Maunalua Bay, Oahu	54,600	232,200	4.2
Lahaina, Maui	32,900	47,400	1.4
Hana, Maui	88,200	107,100	1.2
Reeds Bay, Hawaii	24,600	53,300	2.2
Total	394,500	847,200	2.1

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash a part of the first cost of construction of the general navigation facilities comprising breakwaters, protective roles, and entrance channels, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined, as follows:

Location	Construction cost [1]	Local cash contribution	
		Percent	Present estimate
Hanalei Bay, Kauai	$669,000	48.1	$322,000
Waianae, Oahu	1,794,000	48.0	861,000
Heeia-Kea, Oahu	808,000	49.4	399,000
Kailua, Oahu	487,000	50.0	243,000
Maunalua Bay, Oahu	1,023,000	49.9	510,000
Lahaina, Maui	685,000	46.9	321,000
Hana, Maui	1,839,000	8.7	160,000
Reeds Bay, Hawaii	496,000	50.0	248,000
Total	7,801,000	39.3	3,064,000

[1] Excludes non-Federal costs for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations.

Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including suitable spoil disposal areas with necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; provide and maintain berthing or mooring facilities and attendant utilities, including a public landing with suitable supply facilities open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain depths in the berthing and mooring areas and in the local access channels, commensurate with the depths provided in the related project area; provide and maintain all appropriate onshore structures, access roads, parking areas, public restrooms, and boat-launching ramps as necessary to insure a complete and adequate project; and accomplish necessary utility, drainage, or other relocations or alterations. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes the statewide need for an adequate harbor system for the major islands. There are now 15 State-owned and 5 privately owned small-boat harbors which are heavily overtaxed. The committee considers the eight proposed Federal projects to be urgently needed.

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii

(H. Doc. 68, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Honokahau Bay is on the west coast of the island of Hawaii. The site of the proposed project is about 28 nautical miles south of the Federal deepwater harbor at Kawaihae and about 90 road miles from Hilo, Hawaii. The navigation distance to Honolulu on the island of Oahu is approximately 150 nautical miles.

Authority.—Section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of May 17, 1950.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project at Honokahau Bay. There are public boating facilities at Kailua Bay and Keauhou Bay, 4 and 9 nautical miles south, respectively. The nearest protected harbor is at Kawaihae.

Navigation problem.—There is no adequate harbor along the Kona coast. There is a need for a protected harbor for existing and future recreational and commercial fishing craft.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement provides for an entrance channel 840 feet long and 120 feet wide, a main access channel 660 feet long and 120 feet wide, a service channel 200 feet long and 75 feet wide, wave absorbers on both sides of the entrance channel, and a wave trap.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1963)

Federal	$680,000
Non-Federal	576,000
Total	1,256,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$27,000	$22,400	$49,400
Maintenance and operation	1,300	0	1,300
Aids to navigation	1,100	0	1,100
Total	29,400	22,400	51,800
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			24,200
Commercial fishing			7,300
Recreational fishing			104,100
Total			135,600

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain mooring facilities and utilities, including a public landing with suitable supply facilities open to all on equal terms, and depths in the mooring areas commensurate with depths in the related project areas; provide and maintain an adequate access roadway and all appropriate structures to insure a complete project including launching ramp, parking areas, and public restrooms; contribute in cash in a lump sum prior to commencement of construction 45 percent of the Federal first cost of construction, such contribution presently estimated at $556,000. Local interests have expressed complete accord with the plan of improvement and expressed willingness to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The Kona coast of the island of Hawaii is presently lacking in adequate harbor facilities for local recreation and fishing craft and transient boats, and the improvement would form an important element in the harbor system of the Hawaiian Islands.

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii

(H. Doc. 93, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Honolulu Harbor is on the south coast of the island of Oahu. Barbers Point is about 16 miles due west of Honolulu Harbor.

Authority.—Resolutions of the House Committee on Public Works adopted August 14, 1959, July 19, 1956, and July 16, 1958; and 1950 River and Harbor Act.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for navigation at Honolulu Harbor consists of the Fort Armstrong Channel 40 feet deep, 500 feet wide, and 4,000 feet long; the Kalihi Channel 35 feet deep, 400 feet wide, and 10,300 feet long; a harbor area and interior channels 35 feet deep, and a double-leaf bascule bridge across Kalihi Channel. There is no Federal navigation project at Barbers Point. This is a privately developed barge harbor consisting of an entrance channel 22 feet deep, 220 feet wide, and 1,300 feet long, with an inner basin 21 feet deep, 520 feet wide, and 700 feet long.

Navigation problem.—The existing dimensions of Honolulu Harbor are inadequate for the larger vessels which could use this harbor if depths and channel widths were increased. The existing private harbor for barges at Barbers Point is inadequate for the anticipated commerce expected to be generated by the new industries in the area. A small-boat harbor also is needed in this area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—At Honolulu Harbor: Deepen Fort Armstrong Channel to 45 feet; remove a narrow strip of land on the northeast corner of Sand Island; deepen the main harbor basin and Kapalama Channel to 40 feet; and widen Kapalama Channel by 60 feet along the Sand Island side. At Barbers Point: Provide an entrance channel 42 feet deep, 450 feet wide, and 3,100 feet long; an inner basin 38 feet deep with an area of about 46 acres; a breakwater on the north side of the entrance channel; and an entrance channel 12 feet deep, 80 feet wide, and 1,200 feet long to a small-boat basin.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1963)

	Honolulu Harbor	Barbers Point		Total
		Deep draft	Small boat	
Federal	$2,224,000	$7,643,000	$61,000	$9,928,000
Non-Federal	[1] 2,209,000	[2] 1,451,000	[3] 135,000	3,795,000
Total	4,433,000	9,094,000	196,000	13,723,000

[1] Includes cash contribution of $59,000.
[2] Includes cash contribution of $161,000.
[3] Includes cash contribution of $63,000.

Project economics

	Honolulu Harbor	Barbers Point		Total
		Deep draft	Small boat	
Annual charges:				
Federal	$92,000	$320,900	$3,300	$416,200
Non-Federal	85,900	56,400	5,200	147,500
Total	177,900	377,300	8,500	563,700
Annual benefits:				
Transportation savings	989,000	618,000	0	1,607,000
Commercial fishing	0	0	400	400
Recreation boating	0	0	87,700	87,700
Land enhancement	54,000	33,000	1,300	88,300
Total	1,043,000	651,000	89,400	1,783,400
Benefit-cost ratio	5.9	1.7	10.5	3.2

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash prior to construction 2.6 percent of first cost of construction of the general navigation facilities at Honolulu Harbor, 2.1 percent at Barbers Point deep-draft harbor, and 49.8 percent at Barbers Point small-boat harbor, such contributions being presently estimated at $59,000, $161,000, and $63,000 respectively. Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way. Hold and save the United States free from damages. Provide and maintain adequate terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms. Provide and maintain depths in berthing areas commensurate with project depths. Accomplish utility, drainage, and other relocations

or alterations as necessary. Provide and maintain a suitable access road and necessary mooring facilities and utilities including a public landing at Barbers Point small-boat harbor open to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of the Navy: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes the importance of Honolulu Harbor to both national and international shipping and considers the improvements necessary to maintain the industrial and commercial development of the islands. The deep-draft harbor at Barbers Point would serve to reduce future shipping congestion in Honolulu Harbor.

Houston Ship Channel, Greens Bayou, Tex.

(H. Doc. 257, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Greens Bayou is a small coastal stream which rises northwest of Houston and flows easterly and southerly across Harris County and through the city of Houston for about 44 miles to where it empties into Buffalo Bayou (Houston ship channel)) about 16 miles above Galveston Bay.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted August 15, 1961.

Existing project.—There is no Federal navigation project on Greens Bayou. Local interests have dredged a channel 36 feet deep for a distance of 1,800 feet from the mouth to the port of Houston terminal and 15 to 20 feet deep to mile 1.15.

Navigation problem.—The lack of a dependable depth in the lower 3.7 miles of the channel and two sharp bends in this reach delay the shallow-draft barge tows calling at wharves on Greens Bayou.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Greens Bayou by restoration of the existing channel from mile 0 to mile 0.34 to a depth of 36 feet and a width of 175 feet, with suitable flaring at the entrance from the Houston ship channel, but with no Federal dredging within 75 feet of adjacent wharves; and dredging a channel 15 feet deep and 100 feet wide from mile 0.34 to mile 1.55, thence 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide to mile 2.81, with widening to 150 feet at two sharp bends.

Estimated cost (price level of September 1964)

Federal	$470,000
Non-Federal	210,000
Total	680,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$18,700	$8,400	$27,100
Maintenance and operation	39,000	4,900	43,900
Total	57,700	13,300	71,000
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings			144,500
Vessel damage reduction			3,500
Total			148,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the improvements and for aids to navigation, including suitable areas determined to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and subsequent maintenance; make all alterations of pipelines, powerlines, utility lines, cables, and highway facilities; and provide and maintain at local expense depths in berthing and mooring areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with depths provided in the related project areas. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee believes the improvement is a desirable increment in the continuing development and growth of one of the Nation's important ports in both international and coastal commerce. The improvement of the shallow-draft portion of the channel will provide important transportation saving for barge traffic serving the inland waterway system and vessels engaged in offshore drilling operations.

Indiana Harbor, Ind.

(H. Doc. 227, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Indiana Harbor is at the south end of Lake Michigan, 4.5 miles east of the State line between Illinois and Indiana.

Authority.—In partial response to similar resolutions adopted by the Public Works Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives on May 18, and June 27, 1956, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for: A northerly breakwater 2,520 feet long and an easterly breakwater 3,807 feet long; an entrance channel from the lake about 800 feet wide, 29 feet deep at the outer end, and 28 feet deep at the inner end; an anchorage and maneuver basin in the outer harbor 28 feet deep; a canal en-

trance channel 290 feet wide and 27 feet deep; channels 260 feet wide and 22 feet deep in Indiana Harbor Canal to the forks, and in Calumet River Branch to 141st Street; a channel 160 feet wide and 22 feet deep in the Lake George Branch from the forks to White Oak Avenue; a turning basin 22 feet deep, lakeward of Canal Street and at the forks; and maintenance of a channel 80 feet wide and 20 feet deep in Calumet River Branch from 141st Street to Calumet River.

Navigation problem.—Lack of depth to accommodate vessels in Great Lakes fleet serving local docks.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a depth of 25 feet in the main canal from the landward end of the canal entrance channel for about 2,860 feet to a point lakeward of the Dickey Place Bridge, over a modified channel width of 190 feet except through the bridge opening.

Estimated cost (price level of May 1963)

Federal	$96,000
Non-Federal	197,000
Total	293,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges: Interest and amortization	$3,800	$7,600	$11,400
Annual benefits: Transportation savings			507,400

Benefit-cost ratio.—44.0.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the improvement; provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, depths in berthing areas serving the terminals commensurate with the depth provided in the related project area; and accomplish without cost to the United States such relocations, as may be required, of submarine utility crossings. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the required cooperation for the proposed improvement.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Indiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress, subject to consideration of the recommendations made in its letter. The Bureau notes that the Secretary of the Army recommends that the authorization contain an additional item of local cooperation providing for assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they (local interests) will contribute one-half of the cost of construction dredging, currently estimated at $48,000. The estimated cost to the United States on this basis would be $48,000 for construction. The Bureau believes this to be a reasonable amount of special cost sharing in this project modification. Accordingly, it concurs in the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army. The Bureau considers, further, that if such cost sharing is not provided, construction of the project modification should not commence until there is convincing evidence that there will be additional beneficiaries from the project modification by the time construction is completed.

Remarks.—The committee views this project as a needed element in progressive development of Indiana Harbor in the service of commercial navigation and considers that no special benefits would accrue. Local costs necessary in connection with the project would be more than twice the estimated Federal cost. The committee considers the local cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers to be appropriate.

Jacksonville Harbor, Fla.

(H. Doc. 214, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Jacksonville Harbor is in northeast Florida, about 125 miles south of Savannah Harbor, Ga., and about 145 miles north of Canaveral Harbor, Fla.

Authority.—Resolution by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives adopted May 9, 1957.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for Jacksonville Harbor provides for a channel 34 feet deep and 400 to 1,200 feet wide from the ocean to Commodore Point via a cutoff channel from St. Johns Bluff (Fulton) to Dame Point and via Terminal Channel to Commodore Point, and thence 30 feet deep to the Florida East Coast Railroad bridge, with increased width at the bends; maintenance of two jetties, 1,600 feet apart, built at the entrance under a previous project; construction of training walls and revetments; and a channel 30 feet deep and 750 to 1,100 feet wide along the northerly side of Blount Island. The bar channel was dredged 42 and 40 feet deep and 800 feet wide in 1951, and has been maintained to those dimensions with Navy funds. All depths are referred to local mean low water.

Navigation problem.—Existing channel depths restrict passage of deep-draft vessels to high tides and do not permit full loading of the larger tanks and cargo vessels; present channel depth and widths restrict safe and expeditious maneuvering of vessels.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Maintenance of the existing entrance channel at depths of 42 and 40 feet; deepening of the main ship channel to 38 feet upstream to mile 20; and widening of the channel by 100 feet near mile 5 and by 200 feet near mile 7.

Estimated cost (price level 1963)

Federal	$8,484,000
Non-Federal	226,000
Total	8,710,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$331,000	$27,000	$358,000
Maintenance and operation	57,000		57,000
Navigation	2,000		2,000
Total	390,000	27,000	417,000

	General	Local	Total
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings	$797,000		$797,000
Land enhancement	22,000	$22,000	44,000
Total	819,000	22,000	841,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.0.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 2.6 percent of the contract price plus supervision and administration thereof for all items of work to be provided by the Corps of Engineers, an amount now estimated at $226,000 to be paid in a lump sum prior to start of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final allocation of cost to be made after the actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from any damages that may be attributed to construction and maintenance of the project; and, provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms, and depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depth provided in the related project areas.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—As a result of inadequate channel depths in Jacksonville Harbor the large petroleum and bulk cargo vessels are subject to tidal delays or are restricted to partial loading. Present channel widths and depths restrict expeditious and safe maneuvering of vessels. The committee considers the improvements to be needed to correct these conditions.

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii

(H. Doc. 75, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Kawaihae Harbor is on the northwest coast of the island of Hawaii, about 85 nautical miles northwest of Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, and about 150 nautical miles southeast of Honolulu Harbor on the island of Oahu.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee Resolutions adopted March 17, 1960, and May 10, 1962. House Public Works Committee Resolution adopted May 10, 1962. Section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of May 17, 1950.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for a 2,900-foot-long entrance channel 400 to 520 feet wide and 40 feet deep; a harbor basin 1,250 feet square and 35 feet deep; and a breakwater 2,650 feet long. Local interests have provided adequate terminal and transfer facilities and two harbors for small craft, one near the entrance and one at the inner end of the harbor.

Navigation problem.—The existing project was designed for use by vessels of the size which were expected to use the harbor. Since the project completion the primary users of the harbor have changed to the use of vessels which are 140 feet longer than those for which the project was designed. Present width of channel and size of harbor basin are inadequate for safe operation of the longer vessels except under the most favorable weather conditions. Surge within the basin interferes with loading and unloading operations, particularly at the barge wharf.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The proposed plan consists of widening the seaward 1,200 feet of the entrance channel, widening the harbor basin by 200 feet, lengthening the harbor by a maximum of 500 feet, extending the present breakwater by about 750 feet, constructing a wave absorber at the inner end of the deep draft harbor, and providing a small-boat harbor between the wave absorber and the inner end of the basin.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1963)

Federal	$2,291,000
Non-Federal	46,000
Total	2,337,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$89,000	$1,800	$90,800
Maintenance and operation	7,000	0	7,000
Total	96,000	1,800	97,800
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			12,800
Transportation saving			161,300
Delay prevention			25,900
Land enhancement			4,800
Recreation			55,200
Total			260,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.7.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 0.6 and 46.3 percent of the first costs of construction of the general navigation facilities for the deep- and light-draft harbor improvements presently estimated at $14,000 and $26,000, respectively. Provide lands, easements, rights-of-way for construction and subsequent maintenance including spoil areas and necessary retaining measures or costs thereof. Hold and save the United States free from damages. Provide and maintain adequate public terminals and transfer facilities in the deep-draft harbor open to all on equal terms. Provide and maintain depths in berthing areas commensurate with project depths. Accomplish all relocations. Provide and maintain necessary mooring facilities and utilities including a public landing with suitable supply facilities in the light-draft harbor open to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness to furnish the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that existing project dimensions preclude use of the size of vessel generally in use by the primary users of the harbor. Surge within the harbor basin interferes with loading and unloading operations. The improvements are needed to correct these conditions.

Lexington Harbor, Mich.

(H. Doc. 301, 88th Cong.)

Location.—The village of Lexington is on the southwesterly shore of Lake Huron, about 20 miles from the head of the St. Clair River at Port Huron.

Authority.—River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal navigation project at Lexington. Local interests have constructed a fishing pier extending into water 5 feet deep. Timber piling, remains of old shipping piers, are along the waterfront south of the fishing pier.

Navigation problem.—There is a need for a protected harbor in this area for recreational boating, commercial fishing, and to serve as a harbor of refuge.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvements consisting of breakwaters totaling about 2,000 feet in length with recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater, an anchorage and maneuver area of about 6 acres, 8 feet deep, and a flared approach channel 10 feet deep, decreasing in width to 160 feet between the breakwaters.

The improvement for navigation may be undertaken independently of the public recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater whenever funds for that purpose are available and the required local cooperation has been furnished. The sizing and responsibility for development, maintenance, and replacement of these facilities may be modified in accordance with the alternatives provided in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act depending on the intentions of non-Federal interests redarding participation in the costs of these features at the time of construction and subsequent thereto.

Estimated cost (price level of May 1962)

Federal	$570,000
Non-Federal	359,000
Total	929,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$23,000	$14,700	$37,700
Maintenance and dredging	6,000	2,000	8,000
Maintenance, navigational aids	400		400
Total	29,400	16,700	46,100
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating			33,200
Harbor of refuge			5,000
Commercial fishing			10,500
Fishing from pier			7,000
Total			55,700

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash, due to recreational boating benefits, 39 percent of the first cost of construction of the general navigation facilities, such contribution presently estimated at $348,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and subsequent use, operation, and maintenance of the project; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities including an adequate public landing with provision for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, and a parking lot with adequate sanitary facilities, open to all on equal terms; the dredging of berthing areas to be commensurate with the depth of the Federal improvement; establish a properly constituted and competent public body empowered to cooperate financially and to provide and operate essential local facilities; reserve spaces within the anchorage and mooring facilities adequate for the accommodation of transient craft; pay, contribute in kind, or repay (which may be through user fees) with interest, one-half of the separable cost of the structural modifications necessary to provide for recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater, less one-half of the cost of associated parking facilities to be provided locally, the amount involved currently being estimated at $11,000; and bear all costs of maintenance and replacement of these modifications, the amount involved currently being estimated at $2,000 on an average annual basis.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document 301, 88th Congress, were modified by Department of the Army letter to the Public Works Committee of the Senate dated April 5, 1965. The modification provides conformity with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, with a resultant small increase in Federal cost. The committee considers this change to be appropriate. The committee notes the need for a protected harbor in this area for recreational boating, commercial fishing, and for refuge.

Lorain Harbor, Ohio

Existing project.—The authorized project for Lorain Harbor described in House Document 166, 86th Congress, provides for dredging an area referred to as cut No. 1. This authorization required that local interests provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the project modification.

Navigation problem.—The project as authorized will require the taking of land now used for iron ore storage. Since the area needed for construction of cut No. 1 is now used for other purposes not anticipated at the time local interests furnished assurances of local cooperation, they have recommended construction of a bulkhead to decrease the amount of land required for the project.

Remarks.—The city of Lorain, Ohio, at the time the project for Lorain Harbor was authorized agreed to furnish lands for the project. However, subsequent to authorization these lands are being used for iron ore storage. Modification of the project to provide for Federal construction of a retaining bulkhead decreasing the amount of land necessary for the project is considered by the committee to be necessary and in the public interest.

Mermentau River, La.

(H. Doc. 239, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Mermentau River is formed by the junction of Bayous Nezpique and des Cannes about 2 miles above the town of Mermentau, 35 miles east of Lake Charles, La., and flows generally south for about 72 miles to the Gulf of Mexico.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Public Works Committee adopted June 7, 1961.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for removal of obstructions to navigation in the entire Mermentau River, the lower 25 miles of Bayou Nezpique, and lower 8.5 miles of Bayou des Cannes, and for a channel in the Mermentau River 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to the junction of the two bayous. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway provides shallow-draft channel connections to New Orleans and the Mississippi River on the east and the Texas gulf coast ports on the west.

Navigation problem.—There is need for enlargement of the existing channel as necessary to afford the Mermentau River area the same accommodations for barge service as are available on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Enlargement and realinement of the existing channel in the Mermentau River above the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to dimensions of 12 feet deep and 200 feet wide through Lake Arthur and 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide to the Interstate Highway No. 10 crossings of Bayous Nezpique and des Cannes, and replacement of the highway bridge at Lake Arthur.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1964)

Federal	$2,690,000
Non-Federal	645,000
Total	3,335,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$107,100	$25,600	$132,700
Maintenance and operation	22,600	0	22,600
Increased vehicular costs	0	3,300	3,300
Total	129,700	28,900	158,600
Annual benefits: Savings in operating costs			259,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project aid for aids for navigation, including suitable areas determined to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, buklheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and subsequent maintenance; design and construct a replacement highway bridge at Lake Arthur having clearances of 50 feet vertically above high water and about 200 feet horizontally, and bear 17.1 percent of the cost of design and construction of the birdge by non-Federal interests (exclusive of Corps of Engineers costs), a sum currently estimated at $338,000, and maintain and operate the bridge after construction without cost to the United States; provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms, and depths in mooring areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in related project areas; and make all modifications to roads, bridges, pipelines, cables, and any other utilities (except the Lake Arthur highway bridge). Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Public Health Service: Favorable.
State of Louisiana: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The recommendation to modify the existing project by constructing this branch channel to the same dimensions as the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway with which it connects is logical. The

enlarged channel would increase the safety and efficiency of the barge traffic and larger vessels operating over other connecting waterways into the Gulf of Mexico.

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Va.

(H. Doc. 187, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The southern end of Chesapeake Bay.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 15, 1961.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for Norfolk Harbor provides in general for a main channel 40 feet deep and 1,500 feet wide from deep water in Hampton Roads to a point just south of the Hampton Roads Army Terminal piers; thence 40 feet deep and 750 feet wide to the mouth of Southern Branch of Elizabeth River; thence 40 feet deep and 450 feet wide up this branch to the Belt Line Railroad bridge, a total distance of 13.8 miles, including an approach and turning area of the same depth opposite the Norfolk Naval Shipyard; thence 35 feet deep, 375 feet wide and one mile long to the first Norfolk and Western Railway bridge; thence 35 feet deep, 250 feet wide, and 3.1 miles long to a turning basin of the same depth and 600 feet by 600 feet; for subsidiary channels in the Eastern and Western Branches and Scotts Creek; anchorage areas on the west side of the 40-foot channel opposite Lambert Point and south of Craney Island aggregating 173 acres, consisting of: one anchorage space 1,500 feet square and 38 feet deep; one anchorage space 1,500 feet square and 35 feet deep; and one anchorage space 1,000 feet wide, 3,000 feet long, and 20 feet deep; another anchorage of 45 acres, 12 feet deep, near Pinner Point; and a disposal area of about 2,500 acres adjacent to and north of Craney Island with appurtenant facilities.

A prior report, submitted to Congress April 7, 1965, recommends modification of the project for Norfolk Harbor to provide two anchorages at is junction with channel to Newport News and opposite Sewells Point, 40 feet deep over swinging radii of 1,200 feet, and widening of the Newport News Channel from 600 to 800 feet.

Navigation problem.—The improvement of channel and anchorage facilities has not kept pace with the port's increase in waterborne commerce and number of deep-draft commercial vessels that are being used.

Recommended plan of improvements.—Provides for deepening Thimble Shoal Channel, channel to Newport News, and Norfolk Harbor Channel upstream to Lambert Point to a depth of 45 feet over channel widths as currently authorized, except that the Craney Island reach of Norfolk Harbor Channel is to be widened from 750 feet to 800 feet, and the channel to Newport News is to be widened from 600 feet to 800 feet as recommended in a prior report; and deepening of four 40-foot anchorages, recommended in a previous report, to a depth of 45 feet with the easternmost anchorage at Sewells Point opposite the U.S. Naval Station, Norfolk, and the adjacent naval maneuvering area to be dredged initially; and the dredging of the three remaining anchorages (westernmost anchorage at Sewells Point and the two opposite Newport News) to be deferred until the need therefor develops; and extension of the existing 40-foot channel in

Southern Branch upstream a distance of 1 mile to the Norfolk and Western Railway bridge; and provision of a turning basin in the Southern Branch opposite the mouth of St. Julian Creek.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1964)

Federal	$25,600,000
Non-Federal	500,000
Total	26,100,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,171,300	$20,000	$1,191,300
Maintenance and operation	68,700	0	68,700
Total	1,240,000	20,000	1,260,000
Annual benefits:			
Elimination of damages and savings in time			10,000
Transportation savings			6,388,000
Total			6,398,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—5.1.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and subsequent maintenance of the improvements; accomplish without cost to the United States such alterations and relocations of sewer, water supply, drainage, and other utility facilities as may be required for construction of the project; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas and local access channels commensurate with depths provided in the related project areas. Local interests are willing and able to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Virginia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee considers that the project is urgently needed to provide for the larger vessels, including coal carriers, that are using this port. The committee notes the close functional relationship between anchorage areas and other features of the project.

New York and New Jersey Channels

(H. Doc. 108, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Northeast corner of Staten Island, N.Y. Entrance to Kill Van Kull from upper New York Bay.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted March 30, 1955, and June 27, 1956.

Existing project.—Provides for a channel through lower New York Bay, Raritan Bay, Arthur Kill, lower Newark Bay, and Kill Van Kull to upper New York Bay, with depths of 37 feet in rock and 35 feet in soft material, with widths of 500 to 800 feet; two anchorages 38 feet deep; a dike north of Shooters Island; and two secondary channels 30 feet deep and 400 feet wide, one south of Shooters Island and the other in Raritan Bay connecting with Raritan River.

Navigation problem.—Insufficient width of entrance channel to Kill Van Kull from upper New York Bay for the existing and prospective commerce.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for widening the entrance channel to Kill Van Kull from upper New York Bay to a width of 1,400 feet in the bay to a point near the intersection with the channel along the New Jersey pierhead line, thence narrowing to a minimum width of 1,000 feet to a point opposite the east end of Constable Hook, a distance of 1.1 miles, all to the presently authorized depths of 37 feet in rock and 35 feet in other material.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1963)

Federal	$2,581,000
Non-Federal	0
Total	2,581,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$100,000	0	$100,000
Maintenance	20,000	0	20,000
Total	120,000	0	120,000
Annual benefits:			
Reduction in vessel damage			185,130
Reduction in transit time			48,790
Reduction in vessel delays			79,030
Total			312,950

Benefit-cost ratio—2.6.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the recommended improvement, and for maintenance of aids to navigation, upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial disposal of spoil; and hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from the construction and maintenance of the improvement. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee considers that the recommended improvement is urgently needed to provide safe and efficient use of the channel.

New York Harbor, N.Y. (Anchorage Areas)

(S. Doc. 17, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The New York metropolitan area.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted July 16, 1957.

Existing project.—Provides for Ambrose Channel from the ocean through the lower bay to the Narrows, a distance of 10.2 miles, a width of 2,000 feet, and a depth of 45 feet below mean low water; for anchorage channel, a 5.7-mile extension of Ambrose Channel with the same depth and width from the Narrows through the anchorage grounds in the upper bay to the Hudson and East Rivers; for the southerly entrance channel and bayside channel from the ocean, east of Sandy Hook, to the junction with main ship channel, a distance of 7.1 miles, a width of 800 feet and a depth of 35 feet below mean low water; for main ship channel, from bayside channel to deep water in the lower bay, a distance of 5.3 miles, a width of 1,000 feet and a depth of 30 feet below mean low water; for the removal of Craven Shoal to a depth of 30 feet below mean low water; for a channel 2.3 miles long, 200 feet wide, and 16 feet deep at mean low water reaching from bell buoy 23 to Hoffman and Swinburne Islands; for an irregular, triangular-shaped anchorage area in the southerly half of Red Hook Flats with an area of about 442 acres and depths of 40 and 30 feet below mean low water; for an anchorage in the vicinity of Liberty (Bedloe) Island, with an area of about 160 acres and a depth of 20 feet at mean low water; and for a channel along New Jersey pierhead line connecting Kill Van Kull with deep water in anchorage channel at a point south of the Liberty Island anchorage, a distance of about 3 miles, a width of 500 feet, increasing to 800 feet at bends, and a depth of 20 feet at mean low water.

Navigation problem.—The increase in use of large tankers and dry-cargo vessels has resulted in serious congestion in the existing anchorage areas and accidents due to grounding and collisions.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for deepening the southern section of anchorage 21B (Red Hook Flats) south of the fairway, for a width of about 2,000 feet over an area of 145 acres, from a depth of 30 and 40 feet below mean low water to 45 feet below mean low water; the middle section for a width of about 3,300 feet over an area of 187 acres, from a depth of 30 and 40 feet below mean low water to 40 feet below mean low water; and the northern section for a width of about 3,900 feet over an area of 150 acres, from a depth of 30 feet below mean low water to 35 feet below mean low water; enlarging and deepening anchorage 21B (Red Hook Flats) north of the fairway, to an average width of 2,700 feet and extending the length to the Buttermilk Channel cutoff so as to encompass 446 acres, and deepening from a natural depth of 14 feet and more at mean low water to 35 feet below mean low water including the westerly 3,200 feet of the fairway; and deepening anchorage 49C in Gravesend Bay for a width of about 2,300 feet over an area of 334 acres, from a depth of 30 feet and more at mean low water to 47 feet at mean low water and changing its existing regulations to permit its use by commercial vessels and passenger liners when use of the anchorage by naval and military vessels will permit.

Estimated cost (price level of November 1963)	
Federal	$44,852,000
Non-Federal	
Total	44,852,000
Project economics	
Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	1,748,800
Maintenance	100,000
Total	1,848,800
Annual benefits:	
Elimination of vessel damage	76,000
Savings in transportation	2,604,000
Total	2,680,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and maintenance of the project and for construction and maintenance of aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers; hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from construction and maintenance of the project including submarine structures; and accomplish without cost to the United States removal or relocation of pipelines and other utilities, if necessary. Local interests are able and willing to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that there is a need for additional anchorage areas due to the increase in the size of vessels as well as the congestion in the existing anchorages.

Oceanside Harbor, Calif.

(H. Doc. 76, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Oceanside Harbor is on the coast of southern California about 30 miles north of San Diego. It is situated adjacent to the Del Mar boat basin (Camp Pendleton) and within the city of Oceanside.

Authority.—Public Law 14, 79th Congress, approved March 2, 1945.

Existing project.—There is no Federal project for general navigation. The Del Mar boat basin, developed by the Navy, consists of two jetties, an entrance channel, and an inner basin for military craft. Local interests constructed the Oceanside small-boat harbor in 1963 which consists of an approach channel 20 feet deep common to the Del Mar basin, and inner channels and a turning basin 10 to 20 feet deep, protected by a jetty, groin, and revetment. The Oceanside Harbor served as a source of material for the Federal beach erosion project at Oceanside which was completed in 1963.

Navigation problem.—The approach and entrance channels are subject to shoaling from upcoast and downcoast littoral drift. Local interests desire Federal maintenance of the general navigation facili-

ties of Oceanside Harbor. The Navy has requested that maintenance of the approach and entrance channels to Del Mar boat basin be combined with the project for maintenance of Oceanside Harbor.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Federal maintenance of Oceanside Harbor at an estimated annual cost of $210,000 of which $10,000 would be for structural maintenance and $200,000 would be for maintenance dredging to be paid in equal apportionment from funds allotted to the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Navy.

Estimated cost (Oceanside Harbor only, if constructed as a Federal project, 1962–63 price level)

Federal	$661,000
Non-Federal	759,000
Total	1,420,000

Project economics (Oceanside Harbor, if constructed as a Federal project)

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$25,900	$29,700	$55,600
Maintanence and operation	110,000	0	[1] 110,000
Total	135,900	29,700	165,000
Annual benefits: Recreational boating and fishing			257,800

[1] Excludes $100,000 for entrance channel to Del Mar basin.

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Furnish lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save the Unired States free from damages; provide adequate service frontage and a public landing with suitable supply facilities, necessary mooring facilities, and utilities, access roads, parking areas, and related public-use shore facilities, open to all on equal terms; operate a general anchorage area and/or mooring facilities open to all on equal terms; secure and hold in the public interest all lands bordering the development to a width for proper functioning of the harbor; and be responsible for any maintenance required as a result of flooding from the San Luis Rey River over the flood control wall into the south harbor channel. Local interests have expressed willingness to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of the Navy: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the small-boat harbor constructed by local interests at Oceanside serves general navigation, and that, combining maintenance of the channels for the Navy's Del Mar boat basin with the channels for Oceanside Harbor would reduce overall maintenance costs. The committee believes that maintenance of the general navigation features of Oceanside Harbor, together with the channels to Del Mar boat basin, is an appropriate Federal undertaking.

Local interests performed dredging during August 1965 within the project limits as would be defined by the recommendations in House

Document 76, 89th Congress. Performance of this dredging was necessary in the interest of safety to navigation and to permit the continued efficient use of the harbor. Accordingly, the committee considers it appropriate that the Secretary of the Army be authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests on the projects after August 1, 1965. The committee recommends that reimbursement be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Army that the work is in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, Removal of Drift, District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland

(H. Doc. 286, 89th Cong.)

Location.—In the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 15, 1961.

Existing project.—None for removal of drift.

Navigation problem.—Local boatmen and marina operators have expressed growing concern for the navigation hazards presented by floating debris. The fast growing popularity of recreational boating as a family sport or hobby has greatly increased the accident rate in this area. Elimination of this safety hazard and constant source of boat damage is both desirable and necessary. Also of considerable importance is the esthetic value of a watercourse in the Nation's Capital free of debris.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A separate project for the removal of drift and debris from the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers and their tributaries in the Washington metropolitan area from the head of tidewater to Mount Vernon, Va.

Project economics

Annual charges: Maintenance and operation	$155,000
Annual benefits: Elimination of damages	188,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—None required.

Comments of the States and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
District of Columbia: Favorable.
Commonwealth of Virginia: Favorable.
State of Maryland: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee recognizes the fast growing popularity of recreational boating and the hazard to vessels due to floating debris. It considers this an important improvement for vessel safety as well as contributing to the esthetic value of a watercourse in the Nation's Capital free of debris.

Perdido Pass Channel, Ala.

(S. Doc. 94, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Perdido Bay, a landlocked body of water, lies on the gulf coast about midway between Mobile Bay, Ala., and Pensacola Bay, Fla.

Authority.—Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted March 26, 1960.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project.

Navigation problem.—Due to shallow depth, navigation through the pass is limited to drafts of 4 feet or less. Craft requiring greater depths use route through Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Pensacola Pass about 13 miles easterly. Channel hazardous for all types and sizes except during calm weather.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Perdido Bay, Ala., to provide for a channel 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide, stabilized by twin rubblemound jetties, from the Gulf of Mexico into Perdido Pass, thence 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide into Perdido Bay with a spur channel of the same dimensions leading into Terry Cove.

Estimated cost (price level of September 1963)

Federal	$625,000
Non-Federal	481,000
Total	1,106,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$26,000	$20,000	$46,000
Maintenance	65,000	0	65,000
Maintenance aids to navigation	3,000	0	3,000
Total	94,000	20,000	114,000
Annual benefits:			
Shore protection			10,000
Recreational boating			113,000
Commercial fishing			31,000
Total			154,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 43 percent of the first cost of construction, such contribution presently estimated at $471,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to construction or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor, or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the

construction works and maintenance thereof, including erosion that might result to adjacent shorelines and damages to shoreline bulkheads, wharves, piers, and bridges; provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities including an adequate public landing or wharf with provision for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, available to all on equal terms; and maintain adequate terminal facilities, including berths and access channels, open to all on equal terms. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Alabama: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the proposed improvement will provide a safe stable channel through the pass for recreational and commercial fishing vessels.

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Fla.

(H. Doc. 74, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Ponce de Leon Inlet is located on the northeastern coast of Florida about midway between St. Augustine and Canaveral Harbors.

Authority.—Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives on July 16, 1958.

Existing project.—No Federal project authorized. Dredged twice for the Navy about 1943—once to 14 feet (860,000 cubic yards) and then to 16 feet depth (317,000 cubic yards). Both times serious shoaling occurred within about 1 year.

Navigation problem.—Rapid shoaling and shifting of the channel has resulted in loss of life and boat damage. A safe and stable channel is needed.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Improvement of Ponce de Leon Inlet, Fla., for small-craft navigation and beach improvement by provision of navigation channels across the ocean bar and through the inlet with depths and widths of 15 by 200 feet, 12 by 200 feet, and 12 by 100 feet, and thence southward 12 by 100 feet in Indian River North and northward 7 by 100 feet in Halifax River, both legs joining the Intracoastal Waterway; ocean jetties about 4,200 feet long and about 2,700 feet long on the north and south sides of the inlet, respectively; and sand bypassing facilities consisting of a notch or weir in the north jetty, an impoundment basin for littoral drift adjacent to the weir, and pumping by conventional pipeline dredge through a submerged discharge pipeline across the inlet.

Estimated cost (price level of February 1963)

Federal	$1,104,000
Non-Federal	1,435,000
Total	2,539,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$43,700	$61,200	$104,900
Maintenance of project	123,900	53,600	177,500
Maintenance of navigation aids	1,400		1,400
Economic loss of land		7,400	7,400
Total	169,000	122,200	291,200
Annual benefits:			
Commercial fishing			56,000
Recreational boating			180,000
Beach improvement			129,000
Total			365,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 54.9 percent of the contract price plus supervision and administration thereof for all items of work to be provided by the Corps of Engineers, an amount presently estimated at $1,345,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to start of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final allocation of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined; contribute in cash $1,379,000 toward the cost of future maintenance and operation to be performed by the Corps of Engineers, that amount to be placed by local interests in escrow when required by the Chief of Engineers prior to start of construction and to be contributed upon completion of Corps of Engineers construction; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and alterations to existing improvements required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor, or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages, including shore erosion damages, due to the construction and future maintenance of the works; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States necessary mooring facilities and utilities including an adequate public landing or wharf with provisions for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, available to all on equal terms. Local interests are willing and able to comply with requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the improvements would provide a needed harbor of refuge, increase commercial and recreational boating activities and reduce loss of life and property damage.

Port Orford, Oreg.

(S. Doc. 62, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Port Orford is located on the Oregon coast 250 miles south of the Columbia River and 390 miles north of San Francisco.

Authority.—Resolution, Senate Committee on Public Works, adopted March 7, 1960.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project at Port Orford. Local interests have constructed a lumber and fish dock and a breakwater. The dock has been destroyed by storms and rebuilt four times.

Navigation problem.—Harbor is exposed to south and southwest storms which cause extensive damage to dock facilities and small boats and hamper vessel loading.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A 550-foot extension of the breakwater.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1963)

Federal	$696,000
Non-Federal	6,000
Total	702,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$28,100	$200	$28,300
Maintenance and operations	3,500	0	3,500
Navigation aids	2,500	0	2,500
Total	34,100	200	34,300
Annual benefits:			
Transportation saving			34,600
Damages prevented			16,300
Commercial fishing			10,500
Harbor of refuge			3,000
Recreational boating			900
Total			65,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.9.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 0.9 percent of the first cost of construction, presently estimated at $6,000, in a lump sum prior to construction; provide all lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain public terminal and transfer facilities, including suitable depths in berthing areas, open to all on equal terms. Local interests have expressed willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Oregon: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that adequate depths are available to accommodate existing and projected traffic and that provision of the recommended breakwater will permit establishment of a dependable year-round shipping schedule. The project will provide refuge and eliminate the need to remove fishing vessels from the water during storms.

Providence River and Harbor, R.I.

(S. Doc. 93, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Providence River is a tidal estuary extending northward from Narragansett Bay about 8 miles to the vicinity of Providence, R.I. The upper 2.5-mile section comprises the main harbor of Providence.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, adopted January 6, 1950.

Existing project.—Existing Federal project provides for a channel 35 feet deep from North Point in Narragansett Bay to Fox Point in Providence Harbor, generally 600 feet wide for 8.1 miles, thence ranging up to 1,700 feet in width over the remaining 2.6 miles. A federally maintained channel, 16 feet deep and 50 to 230 feet wide in Seekonk River, extends from Red Bridge to Pawtucket, a distance of 3.4 miles. A Federal project, under construction in 1962, provides for a hurricane barrier across the estuary at Fox Point with a gated opening restricted to small-craft navigation.

Navigation problem.—Many of the larger vessels serving the harbor are subject to tidal delays or are restricted to partial loading, and the present channel is inadequate for entry by large tankers.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A channel 40 feet deep, generally 600 feet wide from deep water in Narragansett Bay just south of Prudence Island Light to the turn below Field Point at Providence and thence up to 1,700 feet wide to the existing project limit at Fox Point, with easing of bends to a minimum radius of 5,000 feet and excluding the marginal strip 75 feet wide channelward of the established harbor lines; and a channel 30 feet deep and 150 feet wide, extending northeastward from the upper end of the existing project to the vicinity of India Point at the mouth of the Seekonk River.

Estimated cost (price level of December 1962)

Federal	$13,900,000
Non-Federal	
Total (includes $200,000 for the India Point Channel)	13,900,000

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	450,300
Maintenance and operation, dredging	24,000
Maintenance and operation, navigation aids	2,900
Total	477,200
Annual benefits: Transportation savings	989,900

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.1.

Local cooperation.—Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the project; and provide and maintain at local expense depths in berthing areas commensurate with those in related project areas. Local interests are willing to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Rhode Island: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to submission of the report to Congress. However,

the Bureau states that all projected benefits of the proposed Federal investment for India Point Channel would accrue to a single beneficiary, with no assurance that either the lands or the channel will be used by any shipper other than Tidewater within a reasonble period of time. The Bureau believes that requirements of local cooperation consistent with special, rather than general, benefits should be applied. It recommends that if the India Point Channel is authorized by the Congress conditions of authorization require that prior to expenditure of Federal construction funds, local interests agree to pay 50 percent of construction costs of the India Point Channel and that if such cost sharing is not provided, construction of the channel not commence until such time as there are additional users or the Secretary of the Army determines that there will be additional users within a reasonable period of time.

Remarks.—The committee views this project, including the India Point Channel, as an overall progressive development of Providence River and Harbor, both needed and well justified in the interest of general navigation. The committee considers that no special benefits would accrue, and that the items of local cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers are appropriate.

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio

(H. Doc. 352, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Rocky River Harbor is on the south shore of Lake Erie, in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, about 6.5 miles west of Cleveland Harbor and 21.5 miles east of Lorain.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 3, 1959, and River and Harbor Act of 1945.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for Rocky River Harbor consists of an east entrance pier 900 feet in length and an entrance channel 100 feet wide and 10 feet deep, extending from that depth in Lake Erie to a point 600 feet inside the inner end of the entrance pier.

Navigation problem.—The natural channel in Rocky River is winding, irregular in width, and poorly defined. For lack of any other area of deep water within the harbor, large transient craft must anchor in or near the natural channel.

Recommended plan of improvement.—An anchorage basin of about 2 acres, 10 feet deep; realinement and upriver extension of the existing Federal channel for a distance of about 100 feet, 10 feet deep; thence a channel, 100 feet wide and about 1,700 feet long to a point near the railroad bridge, 8 feet deep; and thence a channel 60 feet wide and about 1,850 feet long to the public boat-launching facilities with suitable widening in the vicinity of the public dock and at the upstream end adjacent to the public boat-launching facilities, 6 feet deep in soft material and 7 feet deep in hard material.

Estimated cost (price level of February 1963)

Federal	$235,000
Non-Federal	225,000
Total	460,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$9,400	$9,100	$18,500
Maintenance	10,000		10,000
Total	19,400	9,100	28,500
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating			86,800
Flood damages prevented			1,000
Total			87,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.1.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 49 percent of the first cost of construction due to recreational boating benefits, such contribution presently estimated at $225,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the project; establish a competent and properly constituted public body empowered to cooperate financially and to provide and operate essential local facilities including regulation of the use, growth, and free development of the harbor facilities with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, depths commensurate with the depths of the Federal channel improvements in service channels to principal docks and in berthing areas; and continue to maintain without cost to the United States the existing public dock and launching facilities open to all on equal terms. Local interests are willing to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Ohio: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The existing navigation facilities are inadequate for the recreational craft using the harbor. The committee considers the improvement is needed to correct this condition.

Rondout Harbor, N.Y.

(H. Doc. 288, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Rondout Harbor is on the west bank of the Hudson River at Kingston, N.Y., 89 miles north of the Battery, New York City.

Authority.—House Public Works Committee resolution adopted May 10, 1962.

Existing project.—Provides for a channel 100 feet wide with widening at the bends, and 14 feet deep at mean low water from deep water in the Hudson River to the highway bridge at 1.3 miles upstream of the mouth, thence 12 feet deep at mean low water to the west end of island dock at 1.8 miles upstream of the mouth, to parallel

dikes at the mouth and a branch dike extending upstream from the outer end of the north dike.

Navigation problem.—Local interests desire that the channel for a distance of about 1.7 miles above the existing Federal project be improved by the Federal Government.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification of the existing project by extending the Federal channel at a width of 100 feet and a depth of 12 feet at mean low water, 1.7 miles upstream from the upper limit of the existing Federal project at mile 1.8 to mile 3.5.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1964)

Federal	$20,000
Non-Federal	0
Total	20,000

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	4,800
Maintenance and operation	7,600
Total	12,400
Annual benefits: Transportation savings	56,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.5.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the Federal project as modified and for construction and maintenance of aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the project; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in berthing areas serving terminals commensurate with depths provided in the related project areas. Local interests have indicated that they are willing and able to provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior. Favorable.

State of New York: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection to submission of the report to Congress. However, the Bureau states that it appears that the final 0.8 mile reach of the proposed modification would be the area in which virtually all of the initial construction dredging would be required, and would at least initially, benefit only a single shipper. Accordingly, the Bureau recommends that if the project modification is authorized by the Congress, provision for special cost sharing be required.

Remarks.—The committee notes that no special benefits will accrue, that there are opportunities for siting of additional shippers along the channel, and considers the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers to be appfopriate.

Saginaw River, Mich.

(H. Doc. 240, 89th Cong.)

Location.—On west shore of Lake Huron, head of Saginaw Bay, at Bay City, Mich.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives adopted April 14, 1964.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for an entrance channel 27 feet deep and 350 feet wide from deep water in Saginaw Bay to the river mouth, thence a channel 26 feet deep and 200 feet wide for about 0.4 mile, thence 25 feet deep and 200 feet wide to the Detroit and Mackinac Railway bridge in Bay City, thence 22 feet deep and 200 feet wide to a point 2,800 feet upstream from the Sixth Street Bridge in Saginaw, thence 16½ feet deep and 200 feet wide to the upstream limit of the project at Green Point, a total distance of about 29 miles, and five turning basins varying in depths from 25 to 15 feet.

Navigation problem.—The existing project depth of 22 feet is inadequate to permit safe navigation by Navy ships now under construction at the Defoe Shipbuilding Co. located immediately downstream from the New York Central Railroad bridge. The deeper channel would also permit the use of larger vessels delivering limestone to a terminal in the reach under consideration.

Recommended plan of improvement.—That the existing project for Saginaw River, Mich., be modified to provide for deepening to 25 feet the reach of the channel in Bay City, Mich., extending from the upper end of the existing 25-foot project, immediately below the Detroit and Mackinac Railway bridge, upstream to the downstream side of the New York Central Railroad bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of March 1965)

Federal	$437,000
Non-Federal	70,000
Total	507,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges: Interest and amortization	$17,500	$2,800	$20,300
Annual benefits: Transportation savings			35,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.8.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for the construction and maintenance of the project upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvement; provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in dockside areas and approaches thereto commensurate with the depths provided in related project areas; and

accomplish without cost to the United States such alterations to utility crossings and additional bridge pier protection as required because of the improvement. Local interests are willing and able to meet these requirements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Michigan: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the improvement will meet an emergency situation created in part by the low levels of the Great Lakes, as well as provide future navigation benefits.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Channels, California

(H. Doc. 208, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The deepwater navigation system under consideration extends for approximately 100 miles between an offshore bar in the Pacific Ocean near San Francisco and the inland port of Stockton, Calif.

Authority.—Six House Public Works Committee resolutions dated March 30, 1955; June 13, 1956; June 27, 1957 (two resolutions); August 15, 1961; and May 10, 1962.

Existing project.—The portions of existing projects for which modifications are proposed consist of (1) San Francisco Harbor (bar channel, 50 feet deep, 2,000 feet wide); (2) Richmond Harbor (approach channel and maneuvering area, 35 feet deep); (3) San Pablo Bay (channel 35 feet deep, 600 feet wide); (4) Suisun Bay (channel 35 and 30 feet deep, 300 feet wide); and (5) the San Joaquin River project (channels 30 feet deep and 400 and 225 feet wide).

Navigation problem.—Primary difficulties result from inadequate depths. Vessels are required to light load, lighter, and/or await high tides. A serious collision hazard exists in the narrow Suisun Bay Channel downstream of the naval ammunition depot at Port Chicago where the channel is traversed by both ammunition ships and supertankers. The route of the San Joaquin River project for a distance of about 15 miles is difficult to navigate particularly during periods of winter fog.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan of improvement would provide for modification of the five projects to provide depths of 55 feet for the San Francisco Bar Channel, 45 feet for the main internal bay channels upstream to the vicinity of Pittsburg, and 35 feet from Pittsburg to Stockton. It would provide for the enlargement and deepening to 45 feet of maneuvering areas adjacent to major petroleum refinery terminals along the channel route, widening the Suisun Bay Channel, providing access and turning basin facilities for a potential harbor in the vicinity of Antioch, constructing a cutoff route to Stockton through False River and across certain delta tracts, and constructing a new channel in upper San Francisco Bay leading through the west navigation opening in the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	[1] $46,853,000
Non-Federal	13,692,000
Total	60,545,000

[1] Net cost to Federal Government after reimbursement for recreation is $46,202,000.

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$1,910,000	$596,000	$2,506,000
Maintenance and operation	1,413,000	252,000	1,665,000
Total	3,323,000	848,000	4,171,000
Annual benefits:			
General navigation			9,557,000
General recreation and fish and wildlife			480,000
Land enhancement			169,000
Total			10,206,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; provide all necessary spoil retention dikes; hold and save the United States free from damages; accomplish all utility modifications and relocations; provide and maintain necessary berthing areas at all terminals and wharves to be served by the deepened channels; construct a refinery and appurtenant wharves in the vicinity of Pittsburg; construct a deepwater port at Antioch; provide, maintain, and operate adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; in recognition of local land enhancement benefits which would result from land fill created by dredging spoil, contribute to the United States a sum presently estimated at $392,000; contribute one-half the separable cost allocated to recreation, a sum presently estimated at $651,000; maintain and operate public recreation areas; continue to maintain all existing flood-control levees, including the works for wave-wash protection, and assume the maintenance of new or reconstructed flood control levees.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget notes that the Chief of Engineers recommends, in part, the enlargement and deepening to 45 feet of a maneuvering area adjacent to a refinery owned by the Standard Oil Co. of California. The Bureau notes that the only vessels requiring 45-foot depth in the maneuvering area are those utilizing Standard Oil's terminal facilities and believes that a question exists as to whether this segment of the project benefits more than a single user. If the project is authorized, the Bureau of the Budget would expect that further consideration would be given to this matter prior to any request for funds to initiate construction. If this segment of the project is authorized for construction, the Bureau of the Budget recommends that prior expenditure of Federal construction funds, local interests agree to pay 50

percent of construction costs of the Standard Oil maneuvering area and that if such cost sharing is not provided, construction of the maneuvering area shall not commence until such time as there are additional users or the Secretary of the Army determines that there will be additional users within a reasonable period of time. Subject to consideration of these comments, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of the report to the Congress.

Recommendations of the Secretary of the Army.—After consideration of the report in the light of the comments of the Bureau of the Budget regarding the maneuvering area adjacent to the refinery owned by Standard Oil, the Secretary of the Army recommends the maneuvering area be authorized on condition that construction of this segment of the project not be initiated until compliance with a finding on the single beneficiary question by the Secretary of the Army, which finding may include a requirement that local interests contribute up to 50 percent of the cost of the required dredging.

Remarks.—The recommended project modifications will result in improved navigation conditions of a navigation system extending approximately 100 miles inland to the port of Stockton. The existing channels are of inadequate depth to serve the needs of a large portion of the current vessel traffic. Present channel widths are inadequate for the needs of vessels traversing the Suisun Bay channel downstream of the U.S. Naval Ammunition Depot at Port Chicago. The committee considers this project to be necessary and justified in the interest of safe and efficient navigation. The committee notes the close functional relationship between maneuver areas and other features of the project, and that safe maneuvering of vessels which establish controlling depths in locations such as the Richmond-Long wharf area contributes to the safety and efficiency of operation of vessels of lesser draft. The committee considers that no special benefits will accrue, and that the local cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers is appropriate, without necessity for a subsequent finding by the Secretary of the Army.

There are unusual physical conditions along the San Joaquin River navigation project. The deep peat formation underlying this area makes the levees and wavewash protection thereon difficult to stabilize against subsidence. This wavewash is largely caused by deep-draft vessel operations. Maintenance of these flood control levees is usually and properly the responsibility of local interests. In view of the unusual physical conditions, however, the committee considers that any repair or restoration of wavewash protection, not necessitated because of failure of local interests to perform proper maintenance, is in this instance a matter for Federal assumption.

San Luis, Calif.

(H. Doc. 148, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Port San Luis is located on the coast of southern California about 190 miles northwest of Los Angeles.

Authority.—Resolutions, Senate and House Committees on Public Works, adopted April 28, 1958, and July 16, 1958, respectively.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project, completed in 1913, provides for a breakwater 2,400 feet long.

Navigation problem.—Exposure to storms renders harbor unsafe for both deep and shallow-draft vessels. Breakwater protection and removal of rock shoals needed for development of adequate moorage facilities for commercial and recreational craft.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for rehabilitation and a 1,500-foot extension of existing breakwater; construction of a detached breakwater 4,000 feet long; dredging an entrance channel 500 feet to 550 feet wide and 30 feet deep; a basin 400 feet wide, 1,300 feet long, and 35 feet deep; a basin 400 by 400 feet and 15 feet deep; and an access channel 400 feet wide, 4,000 feet long, and 15 to 20 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1961)

Federal	$6,360,000
Non-Federal	1,550,000
Total	7,910,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$233,000	$72,000	$305,000
Maintenance and operation	67,000	0	67,000
Maintaining navigation aids	1,000	0	1,000
Total	301,000	72,000	373,000
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings			751,000
Increased fish catch			46,500
Fishing boat damages			20,000
Recreational boating and fishing			665,200
Total			1,482,700

Benefit-cost ratio.—4.0

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of the first cost of the detached breakwater, such contribution, presently estimated at $1,550,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction; provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; operate a general anchorage area for refuge open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain adequate public terminal facilities open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain depths in berthing areas commensurate with project depths; make necessary utility changes including removal of existing port San Luis wharf; provide suitable marine repair facilities; provide necessary access road for construction of project. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of California: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—These improvements are needed to protect commercial and recreational craft from storms while in the harbor. In addition, such protection would permit development of moorage facilities which are now inadequate.

Savannah Harbor, Ga.

(H. Doc. 226, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The harbor comprises the lower 21.3 miles of the Savannah River, which forms the boundary between Georgia and South Carolina.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted September 1, 1959.

Existing project.—Provides essentially for deep-water navigation channels ranging from 36-foot depth and 500-foot width at the ocean entrance to 30-foot depth and 200-foot width upstream, turning basins and anchorage basins of corresponding depths, channel enlargements as needed for maintenance, and retaining walls and jetties.

Navigation problem.—Existing channel depths restrict passage of deeper draft vessels to high tides and do not permit full loading of the larger tankers and cargo vessels; present channel widths and limited turning areas restrict safe and expeditious maneuvering of vessels.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Channel 40 feet deep and 600 feet wide across the ocean bar and the entrance to Savannah Harbor, thence 38 feet deep and 500 to 400 feet wide to the vicinity of the Garden City terminal, thence 36 feet deep and 400 feet wide to the vicinity of the Savannah Sugar Refining Corp. terminal; with a turning basin at the Atlantic Coast Line terminal and enlargement of the existing basin near the American Oil Co. terminal, both 34 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level—1961)

Federal	$7,112,000
Non-Federal	208,600
Total	7,320,600

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$271,000	$8,000	$279,000
Maintenance and operation	130,000	36,000	166,000
Total	401,000	44,000	445,000
Annual benefits:			
Elimination of vessel delays			534,500
Savings in stevedore and demurrage expenses			25,800
Total			560,300

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works and maintenance of the improvements; provide and maintain at local expense adequate

public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers; and provide and maintain at local expense depths in berthing areas commensurate with those in related project areas. Responsible local interests have indicated willingness to cooperate in the improvements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Georgia: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that Savannah Harbor is an important port serving the States of Georgia and South Carolina. The improvements will permit greater utilization of this harbor by large modern cargo vessels.

Savannah Harbor, Ga.

(H. Doc. 263, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Savannah Harbor is on the coast of Georgia and comprises the lower 21.3 miles of the Savannah River which forms the boundary between Georgia and South Carolina.

Authority.—Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted September 1, 1959.

Existing project.—Provides for a channel 36 feet deep and 500 feet wide for a distance of 9.7 miles across the ocean bar; thence 34 feet deep and 400 feet wide for a distance of 18.9 miles up the river, widened to 550 feet opposite the Atlantic Coast Line terminal; thence 30 feet deep and 200 feet wide for a distance of 2.45 miles; turning basins 34 feet deep opposite the American Oil Co. refinery and above the Georgia Ports Authority terminal (near Kings Island); and turning basins 30 feet deep near the Savannah Sugar Refining Corp. terminal and at the upper end of the project. The total project length is 31.05 miles. Except for annual maintenance, all work on the existing project has been completed. Local interests have provided and maintain terminals including adjacent berthing areas and slips.

The interim report of June 1962 recommends project modification to provide for a channel 40 feet deep and 600 feet wide across the ocean bar from deep water to station 208 + 145, a distance of about 7 miles; thence 38 feet deep and 500 feet wide in the river to the Atlantic Coast Line terminal (station 124 + 500), 38 feet deep and 400 feet wide to the vicinity of the Garden City (Georgia Ports Authority) terminal (station 94 + 300), and 36 feet deep and 400 feet wide to the vicinity of the Savannah Sugar Refining Corp. terminal (station 88 + 650), a combined distance of 22.6 miles, with widening at bends where necessary; a turning basin 34 feet deep opposite the Atlantic Coast Line terminal; and enlarging the turning basin near the American Oil Co. terminal.

Navigation problem.—Maintenance of Savannah Harbor has long been an item of great expense to the Federal Government and shoaling of the improved channel has been critical to navigation.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A tide gate structure across Back Creek; a sediment basin 40 feet deep, 600 feet wide, and about 2 miles long downstream of the tide gate, with an entrance channel 40 to 38 feet deep and 300 feet wide; a drainage canal 15 feet deep and

300 feet wide across Argyle Island in the upper harbor between Little Back River and Middle River.

Estimated cost (price level, January 1964)

Federal	$6,457,000
Non-Federal	238,000
Total	6,695,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$269,000	$10,000	$279,000
Maintenance and operation	16,000		16,000
Total	285,000	10,000	295,000
Annual benefits:			
Savings on maintenance operations			400,000
Enhancement to fish and wildlife			42,500
Total			442,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.5.

Prior to construction, local interests will be required to provide, without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the sediment basin works upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvements. Responsible local interests have indicated willingness to cooperate in the improvement.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of Georgia: Favorable.

State of South Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that maintenance of Savannah Harbor has long been an item of great expense to the Federal Government and shoaling of the improved channel has been critical to navigation. The tide gate structure and sediment basin in Back Creek would reduce considerably the annual cost of maintenance dredging.

The committee considers it equitable that the project include facilities to mitigate damages to presently developed private lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge which would result from an expected increase in the salinity level attendant upon project construction, at an estimated additional cost of $40,000. The committee also considers that, if the Chief of Engineers determines it necessary and justified, he may include additional facilities to mitigate damages to additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of $60,000. The committee considers it appropriate that all such facilities to mitigate damages be maintained by local interests.

Shrewsbury River, N.J.

(H. Doc. 274, 89th Cong.)

Location.—In Monmouth County in the northeastern part of coastal New Jersey about 20 miles south of the Battery in New York City.

Authority.—Resolutions by the House Public Works Committee adopted June 2, 1949, and April 21, 1950.

Existing project.—Provides in general for a channel 12 feet deep and 300 feet wide, following the westerly shore from deep water in Sandy Hook Bay for a distance of 2.2 miles, thence 9 feet deep and 150 feet wide for a distance of about 6.8 miles and branch channels with depths of 6 feet and widths of 100 and 150 feet.

Navigation problem.—Local interests desire an inlet from Shrewsbury River to the Atlantic Ocean in the vicinity of Spermaceti Cove, near Highlands, N.J. This would provide quick access to a safe harbor and would decrease the travel time to the ocean.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for construction of an inlet across the neck of Sandy Hook Peninsula, between Spermaceti Cove and Island Beach, consisting of an entrance channel 200 feet wide and 15 feet deep; an interior channel 200 feet wide and 9 feet deep with suitable widening in the approach to the existing Shrewsbury River channel; jetties to protect the entrance channel and bulkheads to protect the land cut; and a six-lane, fixed bridge across the land cut with a minimum vertical navigation clearance of 35 feet above mean high water.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1964)

Federal	$4,090,000
Non-Federal	4,090,000
Total	8,180,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$164,000	$162,700	$326,700
Maintenance and operation	277,800	15,000	292,800
Total	441,800	177,700	619,500
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boating			707,000
Commercial boating			4,200
Sport fishing			8,600
Loss to commercial fishing			−4,600
Total			715,200

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, outside the limits of the federally owned lands, required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining

works; hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from the construction works and maintenance of the recommended improvement; provide a cash contribution of 50 percent of the first cost of constructing the improvement, an amount presently estimated at $4,090,000, to be paid in a single lump-sum payment prior to commencement of construction subject to adjustment after final costs have been determined; assume all obligations of owning, operating, and maintaining the highway bridge, with such obligations to be assumed by local interests upon final completion of its construction; assign to a competent and properly constituted public body the power to regulate the use, growth, and free development of adequate boating facilities in the area to be served by the inlet, with the understanding that such facilities will be open to all on equal terms; and provide, maintain, and operate without cost to the United States, necessary mooring and terminal facilities and utilities, including an adequate public landing or wharf with provisions for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, available to all on equal terms. Local interests have furnished assurances that they will provide the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—This improvement will contribute to the safety and efficiency of navigation.

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.

(S. Doc. 43, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The entrance to Tillamook Bay is on the Oregon coast 47 miles south of the mouth of the Columbia River.

Authority.—Resolution, Senate Committee on Public Works, adopted August 3, 1959.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for a jetty about 5,700 feet long on the north side of the entrance; a channel through the bar 18 feet deep and of such width as can be practicably and economically obtained; a channel 18 feet deep and 200 feet wide from deep water in the bay to Miami Cove, terminating at a turning basin 500 feet wide; and initial dredging to a depth of 12 feet of a small-boat basin and an approach thereto at Garibaldi, Oreg. The project also provides for the improvement of Bayocean Peninsula, Oreg., for navigation, by construction of a sand and rockfill dike 1.4 miles long, on an alinement extending between Pitcher Point and the former town of Bayocean.

Navigation problem.—The bay entrance is impassible to small boats and barges for periods ranging up to 10 days. Resulting vessel delay has forced cancellation of all water carrier service. Decline in commercial fishing is directly attributable to the hazardous harbor entrance and lack of year-round fishing opportunity.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Modification of the existing navigation project to provide for an 8,000-foot long south jetty at the entrance to Tillamook Bay.

Estimated cost (price level of October 1964)

Federal	$9,000,000
Non-Federal	0
Total	9,000,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$358,200		$358,200
Maintenance and operation	91,000		91,000
Total	449,200		449,200
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings			423,400
Commercial fishing			94,900
Reduction in damage to fishing gear			6,700
Reduction in maintenance dredging			34,000
Harbor of refuge			20,000
Total			579,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain public terminal and transfer facilities, including depths in berthing areas and local access channels including the 50-foot strip adjacent to pierhead lines commensurate with depths in related project areas. Local interests have expressed willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Oregon: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes the lack of water carrier service and the decline in commercial fishing due to the hazardous harbor entrance. The improvement will permit reestablishment of water carrier service on dependable schedules and provide year-round fishing opportunity by permitting use of the harbor entrance except during relatively short periods of intense storms.

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Mass.

(H. Doc. 247, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Weymouth-Fore River is a coastal stream emptying into Hingham Bay on the south side of Boston Harbor, Mass. Town River, a small tributary, joins Weymouth-Fore River about 2 miles above its mouth.

Authority.—Resolution of the House Public Works Committee, adopted April 9, 1957.

Existing project.—The Federal navigation project for Weymouth-Fore River consists of a channel 32 feet deep in rock, 30 feet deep in other materials, and 500 feet wide from deep water, along the southerly half of the Boston Harbor Narrows channel in Nantasket Roads, through Nantasket (Hull) Gut, thence with the same depth and generally 300 feet wide across Hingham Bay and into Weymouth-Fore

River to the Fore River Bridge, and continuing above the bridge to form a maneuvering basin 470 to 650 feet wide, and a channel generally 300 feet wide and 27 feet deep between Nut and Peddocks Islands; and for Town River consists of a channel 27 feet deep, and generally 250 feet wide, extending from its junction with Weymouth-Fore River to a point 1.3 miles upstream, with a turning basin 450 feet wide and 1,000 feet long at the inner end of the channel, and a channel 15 feet deep and 100 feet wide extending from the upstream limit of the 27-foot channel to a line just below the Quncy Electric Light & Power Co. substation.

Navigation problem.—Project channel dimensions are inadequate for existing deep-draft traffic and preclude use of the larger vessels which are being introduced into coastwise movement of commerce.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a channel 35 feet deep, 37 feet in rock, and 500 feet wide from deep water in Nantasket Roads, and along the southerly half of the Boston Harbor Narrows channel, through Nantasket Gut, then 35 feet deep and 400 feet wide to the mouth of Weymouth-Fore River, then 35 feet deep, generally within the limits of the existing project, to the Weymouth-Fore River Bridge, and then 35 feet deep and generally 400 feet wide to the upper limit of the existing project; a channel 35 feet deep and 300 feet wide, increased from 400 to 550 feet at the bends, from the mouth of Town River to the existing turning basin in Town River, a 35-foot deep turning and maneuvering basin at the confluence of the two rivers in King Cove; enlarging and deepending to 35 feet the existing turning basin in Town River; and 6 acres of 8-foot anchorage to compensate for that part of an existing local small-boat anchorage that would be usurped by widening of the 35-foot commercial channel. It also is recommended that the existing projects for Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Massachusetts, be combined into a single project.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1962)

Federal	$12,500,000
Non-Federal	1,540,000
Total	14,040,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$382,200	$47,000	$429,200
Maintenance	35,400		35,400
Total	417,600	47,000	464,600
Annual benefits:			
Transportation savings			1,493,900
Reduction in tubboat hire			98,100
Total			1,592,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.4.

Local cooperation.—Provide, without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction and subsequent maintenance of the project; make such alterations to sewerlines or other

obstructive features as are necessary; and provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, depths commensurate with channel depth in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals, and maintain the enlargement of the small boat anchorage. Local interests are willing to comply with the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The improvement is needed to permit the efficient use of larger vessels at this port.

Tred Avon River, Md.

(H. Doc. 225, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Tred Avon River is one of numerous tidal estuaries branching indirectly from Chesapeake Bay. It extends northeast about 10 miles from its confluence with the Choptank River, about 10 miles above the mouth of that stream, to Easton Point, about 1 mile below Easton, Md.

Authority.—Resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, on June 27, 1956, and June 23, 1964.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for a channel 8 feet deep and 150 feet wide, with widening at the entrance and at bends, from Peach Blossom Creek to Easton Point, with a turning basin of varying widths at the mouth of the south fork. The project also provides for a channel of the same depth and width and 2,100 feet long in the north fork with a turning basin at the upper end.

Navigation problem.—Insufficient depths caused groundings and damages to the vessels. In addition, a considerable amount of time is lost waiting for favorable tidal conditions.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Provides for a channel 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide in Tred Avon River from that depth in the river near Peach Blossom Creek upstream to Easton Point, thence up north fork about 1,400 feet at the same depth and width; and a turning basin in south fork on the east side of the main channel at Easton Point 250 feet wide, 600 feet long, and 12 feet deep.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1965).

Federal	$323,000
Non-Federal	5,000
Total	328,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$12,960	$200	$13,160
Maintenance	6,000	250	6,250
Total	18,960	450	19,410
Annual benefits:			
Savings in vessel operating costs			29,100
Reduction in vessel damage			17,000
Reduction in lost time			13,600
Total			59,700

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.1.

Local cooperation.—Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefore or the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project, including damages to oysterbeds; continue to maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; establish a competent and properly constituted public body to regulate the use, growth and free development of the harbor facilities with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms; and provide and maintain without cost to the United States depths in the berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas. Local interests have indicated their willingness to comply with these terms.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Maryland: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—In view of the damages to vessels and the time lost waiting for favorable tidal conditions, the committee considers that there is a need for these improvements.

Trinity River and Tributaries, Texas

(H. Doc. 276, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The Trinity River Basin is in eastern Texas. It contains 17,845 square miles, is about 360 miles long and has its maximum width of about 100 miles in the headwaters region above Fort Worth and Dallas. It drains into Trinity Bay, an arm of the Gulf of Mexico.

Authority.—Resolutions of the House Rivers and Harbor Committee of March 31, 1944, February 28, 1945, and November 30, 1945, a resolution of the House Public Works Committee of August 6, 1948, a resolution of the Senate Public Works Committee of January 20, 1958, and the River and Harbor Act of 1958.

Existing project.—There are seven Corps of Engineers reservoir projects in the basin. Four are in operation, one is under construction, two are in preconstruction planning status. Several local flood protection projects have been constructed and others are authorized. Shallow-draft navigation is authorized to Liberty, Tex., about 49 miles upstream from the Gulf of Mexico.

Problems of the area.—Flood damages under existing conditions are estimated at about $2,300,000. The area is also subject to prolonged droughts. The resources and economy of the area are conducive to the development of low-cost barge transportation. There is a problem of maintaining good water quality in the streams, and there is a need for more water-borne recreation facilities.

Recommended plan of improvement.—In his report dated November 29, 1963, the Chief of Engineers recommended improvement of the main Trinity River for the multiple-purpose uses of navigation, flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife, to extend upstream as far as Fort Worth; four multiple-purpose reservoirs, one on the main stem of the river and three on upstream tributaries; five local protection projects for flood control; water conveyance facilities for water supply and water quality control.

Estimated cost (price level, January 1962)

Federal	[1] $859, 796, 000
Non-Federal	50, 954, 000
Total	910, 750, 000

[1] Non-Federal interests to reimburse $122,189,000 for water supply features. Net Federal construction cost: $737,607,000.

Project economics

Annual charges	$39, 291, 000
Annual benefits	56, 192, 000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.4.

Local cooperation.—With respect to navigation, provide the apportioned share of lands and rights-of-way, bridge alteration costs, utility alteration costs, provide and maintain terminal facilities, protect the channel from encroachments, hold and save the United States free of damages; with respect to reservoirs, pay the United States in accordance with the Water Supply Act, the first and annual costs allocated to water supply storage; with respect to local protection projects, provide "(a), (b), (c)," items, protect channel from encroachments; with respect to water conveyance facilities, assume all costs. Local interests have indicated their willingness to comply.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
State of Texas: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the authorization of features recommended for flood protection, water supply, water quality, and recreation, but would expect that prior to any request for funds to construct projects including storage for water quality, the Department of the Army would resolve any problems which may arise on transferring the use of such storage to water supply.

As pertains to navigation, the Bureau states it is clear that a reevaluation, based upon up-to-date information and upon the new criteria which have been established since the original studies on the navigation features were undertaken, cannot be concluded in time for submission of this report. It is therefore the position of the Bureau of the Budget that no recommendation be made at this time on navigation features. The Bureau believes that the corps should initiate an immediate reevaluation of the benefit-cost ratio utilizing current information and policy standards, making the maximum effort to complete the study within 6 months or at the most 1 year. The Bureau suggests that planning for the nonnavigation features be carried on in a way which does not preclude the later addition of navigation, if the study warrants. The total estimated cost of the project now recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is $494 million, of which $338 million would be a Federal cost and $156 million would be non-Federal.

Comments of the Secretary of the Army.—The Secretary's views and recommendations are generally along the lines of those of the Bureau of the Budget. The Secretary notes that all other navigation projects recommended to the Congress before and after the Trinity study have been justified on the basis of no more than a 50-year period, and all projects now under study or planned for study will be justified on such a basis. He notes that using a 50-year period and the interest rate and other policies applicable at the time, the benefit-cost ratio for the Trinity navigation features when the Chief of Engineers made his report was 0.74. The Secretary states he does not consider it appropriate to recommend to the Congress immediate specific authorization of projects which by standard methods of economic analysis are not found to be justified. Accordingly, he recommends against present authorization of those features of the comprehensive plan which are exclusively related to the navigation purpose. The Secretary further states that in the interest of efficient development of the water resources of the basin, the Corps of Engineers will initiate as soon as possible a reevaluation of the navigation features of the plan making a maximum effort to complete this study within 6 months or at the most 1 year from the date funds are made available for the study. He considers it reasonable that improvements for other purposes be constructed on a basis which would not be incompatible with possible ultimate adaption to navigation needs.

Specifically, the Secretary of the Army recommends (*a*) immediate specific construction authorization of five local flood-protection projects, four multipurpose reservoirs, and a flood-control channel, all on a basis not incompatible with future navigation development, and (*b*) authorization of a restudy of the navigation features to be completed before further action with respect to their authorization for construction. The Secretary lists the estimated cost of the foregoing, exclusive of the cost of the restudy, at $494,227,000, with a net Federal share of $338,419,000, and annual operation, maintenance and replacement Federal costs totaling $1,248,000.

The Secretary of the Army points out that he has discussed his recommendations with the Chief of Engineers and the Chief concurs therein.

Remarks.—The committee was enormously impressed with the character and quality of the factual testimony presented in support

of the comprehensive Trinity River development program, including barge navigation from the Gulf of Mexico to Fort Worth. The result of more than 20 years of careful study and methodical planning, the project encompasses in one integrated program all the recognized elements of water resource development—flood control, water conservation for municipalities and industry, quality protection and continuous flow regulation, upstream soil conservation, fish and wildlife preservation, and recreation for the millions of people who live in this great river valley.

The thorough and well-documented report of the division engineer assigned to the total project a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.6 to 1. Since this was based upon permissive use of the 100-year criterion which at the time of the study had been established as the executive standard and published in Senate Document 97, and since Corps of Engineers spokesmen have stated that they now prefer as standard practice to limit economic benefit calculations on all navigation projects to a 50-year period, there is some question as to the precision of this ratio. After carefully analyzing all the available data, the committee is certain that the proposed navigation works and improvements would be useful well beyond the newly proposed 50-year limitation, and concludes in any event that, even on a 50-year basis, the project is manifestly well justified economically.

The committee feels, as a matter of fact, that the projections of the division engineer are extremely conservative. As one case in point, the study of the division engineer concerning available tonnages of grain was based upon the year 1958, which was a thoroughly unrepresentative year, coming as it did at the end of 7 years of drought. Actual grain shipments in world trade across the route of the proposed Trinity Canal by 1963—only 5 years following the base year—had exceeded the total amount anticipated in the corps' study for the year 2010. By Department of Agriculture statistics, there exists today more than *twice* the volume of grain available for shipment by barge through the proposed canal than was anticipated for 1970 by the study of the division engineer. Other commodities follow a similar pattern, and actual testimony to the committee by responsible commercial shippers in the commodities of steel, sand and gravel and phosphate rock, fully support the conclusion that ecomonic benefits derived from the project will far exceed the projections anticipated in each of these areas.

The unusually high degree of local financial cooperation evident in the amounts already spent and formally pledged by State and local interests in the Trinity Basin impressed the committee greatly. To date, a total of $269 million in non-Federal funds have been expended from purely local and State sources in the accomplishment of river basin development. In addition to this, the committee has received formal resolutions from local governing bodies and reputable financial interests pledging the expenditure of $256 million more in wholly non-Federal funds to complement and safeguard the Federal investment.

Thus, a total of more than $500 million in State, local, and private moneys will be spent in the accomplishment of the comprehensive Trinity development program.

The Bureau of the Budget, in commenting upon the Trinity River navigation feature, points out that—

> more recent information on the growth of industry and freight traffic in the area suggests significant changes in the benefits originally assigned to the project.

The Bureau report states:

> We have been impressed by the industrial growth in this region which has occurred since 1958. We recommend, therefore, that a restudy be completed giving appropriate consideration to further developments in the region affecting the economic feasibility of navigation.

The committee, is considering this report from the Bureau of the Budget, noted also that the favorable report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in recommending authorization of the navigation feature, points out that—

> modification of current and anticipated conditions may affect the evaluation of benefits for this work—

and suggests that—

> at such time as funds are requested for initiation of construction of features exclusively for navigation, the Chief of Engineers will submit to the Congress an economic analysis of these features.

The committee considers that the economic analysis should be based upon current standards and the current criteria as to the assumed useful life of the navigation portion.

The committee, with the foregoing thoughts in mind, has voted to authorize the project in keeping with this report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963. This coupled with the authorization of $83 million for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project, will give to the Congress a continuing review of the progress and economic benefits calculations based on current criteria and improved and more current data with respect to the growing volume of commodity shipments available for barge traffic via the canal.

The number of people to be served by this project makes it not incompatible with the total costs of developing this river basin. The entire Trinity River Valley, including the Houston area which will depend upon the Trinity for future water supply, includes better than 3 percent of the Nation's people. More Americans reside and make their living in this huge watershed than can be found in any 1 of 32 States of the Union.

The committee strongly recommends approval of this project.

West Harbor, Ohio

(H. Doc. 245, 88th Cong.)

Location.—West Harbor, Ohio, is on the southwestern shore of Lake Erie about 10 miles northwest of Sandusky, Ohio.

Authority.—River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal navigation project at West Harbor, Ohio. Local interests have dredged the east or "nat-

ural" channel, about 2,000 feet long and 60 to 100 feet in width, to a depth of 4 feet. The west or Gem Beach Channel, constructed by local interests and protected by steel sheet-pile revetments, is about 1,000 feet long, 60 feet wide, and was originally 10 feet deep. Shoaling has reduced the depth to less than 5 feet.

Navigation problem.—Existing navigation facilities are inadequate for the large number of boats using the harbor. When sudden storms occur, many boats normally based at West Harbor are unable to enter the harbor safely because of the shallow depth and limited width available at the entrance.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Two arrowhead breakwaters having an aggregate length of approximately 2,450 feet, extending northeasterly into Lake Erie on either side of the natural entrance; an entrance channel between the breakwaters 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide to the mouth of the natural entrance where the width is reduced to 80 feet and the depth to 8 feet; and an access channel 80 feet wide and 8 feet deep from the inner entrance to a Y near the center of the harbor, a distance of about 4,300 feet, where the channel divides with one arm extending northerly about 3,100 feet and one southerly for about 2,300 feet.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1962)

Federal	$544,000
Non-Federal	544,000
Total	1,088,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$21,100	$25,700	$46,800
Maintenance	5,000		5,000
Navigation aids	1,600		1,600
Total	27,700	25,700	53,400
Annual benefits:			
Recreational boats			111,000
Reduction in boat damage			5,000
Harbor of refuge			5,000
Land enhancement			2,000
Total			123,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—2.3.

Local cooperation.—Contribute in cash 50 percent of the first cost of construction of the general navigation facilities comprising the breakwaters, entrance channel, and access channels, due to recreational boating benefits, presently estimated at $544,000. to be paid in a lump sum prior to initiation of construction, subject to final adjustment after actual costs have been determined; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the cost of such retaining works; hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from

the construction works and maintenance of the project; establish a competent and properly constituted public body empowered to cooperate financially and to regulate the use, growth, and free development of the harbor facilities with the understanding that said facilities will be open to all on equal terms; provide and maintain without cost to the United States an adequate public landing or wharf with provisions for the sale of motor fuel, lubricants, and potable water, available to all on equal terms; and provide and maintain depths commensurate with the depths of the Federal channel improvements in service channels to principal docks and in berthing areas. Local interests are willing to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Ohio: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the existing navigation facilities are inadequate to accommodate the recreational craft based in the area. The improvement is needed to correct this condition.

Beach Erosion Projects

Atlantic City, N.J.

(H. Doc. 325, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Atlantic City is located on the Atlantic Ocean, about 80 miles southwest of Sandy Hook and 45 miles northeast of Cape May.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—The existing project provides for the following protective works: (*a*) Inlet frontage, replacement of damaged concrete seawall at the city park by a steel sheet-pile wall; construction in three stages of a stone jetty about 4,800 feet in length on Brigantine Island (north side of Absecon Inlet); revetment of the Maine Avenue bulkhead; construction of two new stone groins (Caspian and Melrose Avenues) and extensions to six existing groins (Pacific, Euclid, northwest of Atlantic, Grammercy, Madison, and Adriatic Avenues) along Maine Avenue; restoration of about 3,800 feet of beach by placement of about 500,000 cubic yards of sand fill; and (*b*) ocean frontage, extension of the existing jetty at the south side of Absecon Inlet (at Oriental Avenue); construction of five new timber groins (St. Charles Place, Virginia Avenue, near North Carolina Avenue, St. James Place, and Illinois Avenue) and extension to existing stone groin (Vermont Avenue); restoration of about 6,000 feet of beach by placement of about 700,000 cubic yards of sand fill.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Federal participation in the amount of one-half of the costs of periodic nourishment for a period of 10 years, at an estimated average annual cost of $276,000 of which the Federal share would be $138,000; and that the same Federal participation apply on a reimbursable basis to the initial nourishment operation to be accomplished by local interests.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1962)

	Initial nourishment	Periodic nourishment
Federal	$205,000	$138,000
Non-Federal	205,000	138,000
Total	410,000	276,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$100,000	$162,000	$262,000
Maintenance		270,000	270,000
Periodic nourishment	138,000	138,000	276,000
Total	238,000	570,000	808,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			144,000
Decrease in maintenance			8,000
Recreation			2,173,000
Total			2,325,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.0.

Local cooperation.—Continuation of conditions of local cooperation required for Federal participation in the existing project, but with Federal assistance in the costs of periodic and initial nourishment as recommended.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the improvement provides for Federal participation in periodic nourishment of the beach in accordance with current policy.

Cliff Walk, Newport, R.I.

(H. Doc. 228, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Newport is located on Aquidneck Island near the mouth of Narragansett Bay about 25 miles south of Providence.

Authority.—Section 2, River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—No Federal.

Erosion problem.—Continued erosion and retreat of the cliffs and bluffs for many years has resulted in destruction and loss of segments of Cliff Walk at a number of locations.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of improvements for shore protection at Newport, R.I., extending from the west end of Newport Beach to the east end of Bailey Beach, a distance of about 18,000 feet, to consist of intermittent reaches of backfill, dumped riprap, stone mounds, stone slope revetment, stone breakwaters, concrete toe walls, concrete seawalls, concrete parapet walls, and grading and surfacing Cliff Walk and providing drainage therefor.

Estimated cost (price level of July 1963)

Federal	$340,000
Non-Federal	810,000
Total	1,150,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$13,200	$31,500	$44,700
Maintenance	0	11,500	11,500
Total	13,200	43,000	56,200
Annual benefits:			
Recreational benefits			60,850
Prevention of loss of land and walk			11,800
Total			72,650

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Obtain and submit for approval suitable easements, leases, or other proof of the continued right of passage along the walk of the general public, and of satisfactory access, as may be needed, for construction and repair; and assure continued public ownership or control and its administration for public use during the economic life of the project; contribute 58.2 percent of the estimated first cost of construction of all shore structures for protection against erosion by waves and currents below the upper limit of computed wave runup and contribute 100 percent of the estimated first cost of restoration and filling of land, repair, construction and drainage of the walk, and construction of those portions of shore structures above the limit of wave runup, an amount presently estimated at $810,000, the actual local contribution of first cost to be based on actual construction costs of the items of work involved in accordance with the above percentages; maintain, entirely at their own expense, those existing protective structures which are suitable for protection of the walk as indicated in the report of the division engineer; assure maintenance and repair of the walk and protective structures during the economic life of the project as may be required to serve the intended purpose; provide at their own expense all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including temporary access easements for construction; and hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works. Local interests have expressed that they will cooperate in the improvements.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Rhode Island: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee considers that the improvement is needed to restore and protect the walk in order to permit the public to view the natural beauty of the area.

Duval County, Fla.

(H. Doc. 273, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The entire 16-mile ocean shoreline of Duval County is located on the upper Atlantic coast of Florida, south of Nassau Sound and includes Little Talbot Island, St. Johns River entrance, Mayport, Chosen, Atlantic, Neptune, and Jacksonville Beaches.

Authority.—Resolutions of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives adopted January 7, 1963, and June 19, 1963, respectively.

Existing project.—There is no existing Corps of Engineers project for beach erosion control in Duval County.

Beach erosion problem.—The problem consists of erosion and recession of dunes and loss of land where there are no seawalls, and erosion and lowering of the beach profile fronting seawalls with resulting damages to seawalls, ramps, and public and private development.

Recommended plan of improvement.—A protective and recreational beach having a level berm 60 feet wide at elevation 11 feet above mean low water and a natural slope seaward as would be shaped by wave action along the 53,000 feet of shore between the St. Johns River jetties and the Duval-St. Johns County line; and the periodic nourishment for the first 10 years of project life, after completion of the initial fill placement.

Estimated cost (price level of fall 1964)

Federal	$2,266,000
Non-Federal	1,874,000
Total	4,140,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$90,000	$75,000	$165,000
Nourishment	[1] 222,000	178,000	400,000
Total	312,000	253,000	565,000
Annual benefits:			
Damages prevented			291,000
Land enhancement			10,000
Recreation			710,000
Navigation			40,000
Total			1,051,000

[1] For 1st 10 years of project life.

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.9.

Local cooperation.—Prior to construction, local interests are required to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will contribute in cash one-half of the first cost (including contract price, engineering and design, and supervision and administration, and excluding the cost of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations) of all items of work for protection of the non-Federal publicly owned shore to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers, the amount as presently estimated being $1,824,000, to be paid in a lump sum prior to start of construction, or in installments prior to start of

pertinent work items in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final apportionment of costs to be made after the actual costs have been determined; contribute in cash one-half of the periodic nourishment costs, adjusted in accordance with the degree of Federal navigation benefits for the non-Federal publicly owned shores for the first 10 years of project life, now estimated at $178,000 annually, such contributions to be prior to each nourishment operation; periodically nourish the non-Federal publicly owned shores as may be required to serve the intended purpose, after the first 10 years and throughout the economic life of the project; provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations required for construction and subsequent nourishment of the project, now estimated at $50,000; hold and save the United States free from damages that may be attributed to construction and maintenance of the project; control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers; and furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will maintain continued public ownership of and free access to the shore upon which the amount of Federal participation is based, and its administration for public use during the economic life of the project. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The improvement consisting of restoring 53,000 feet of publicly owned beach is to be located along a highly developed residential and recreational area where beaches are gradually deteriorating. The committee notes that wider beaches are needed for protection of shore and shorefront properties and for recreational use.

City of Evanston, Ill.

(H. Doc. 159, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Western shore of Lake Michigan immediately north of Chicago, Ill.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act of 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project for shore protection at Evanston, except for riprap protection at Grosse Point Park and at South Boulevard, was completed by local interests in 1960, with Federal participation in the construction costs. The improvements consist of steel sheet-pile groins and beach replenishment at three locations, Clark Street Beach, Dempster Street Beach, and Lee Street Beach, and riprap protection downcoast of each of the groins.

Beach erosion problem.—Beaches at Grosse Point Park and South Boulevard are being eroded to the extent that the areas suitable for bathing are seriously reduced. There is need for additional recreational beaches in the area.

Recommended plan of improvement.—

Grosse Point Park: Impermeable sheet-pile groin 600 feet long, with sandfill placed on north side extending about 525 feet along the

shore, varying in width from 300 feet at groin to 75 feet at north end. Total fill, 33,000 cubic yards.

South Boulevard: Impermeable steel sheet pile groin 600 feet long, with sandfill placed on north side extending about 800 feet along the shore, varying width from 200 feet at the groin to 500 feet at the north end. Total fill, 300,000 cubic yards.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964)

	Grosse Point Park	South Boulevard	Total
Federal	$236,000	$156,000	$392,000
Non-Federal	100,000	156,000	256,000
Total	336,000	312,000	648,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
ANNUAL CHARGES			
Grosse Point Park:			
Interest and amortization	$9,200	$3,900	$13,000
Maintenance		4,700	4,700
Total	9,200	8,600	17,800
South Boulevard:			
Interest and amortization	6,100	6,100	12,200
Maintenance		9,400	9,400
Total	6,100	15,500	21,600

	Grosse Point Park	South Boulevard
Annual benefits:		
Damages prevented	$2,600	$4,300
Beach area added	42,600	28,400
Total	45,200	32,700
Benefit-cost ratio	2.5	1.5

Local cooperation.—Bear all costs of the work in excess of the recommended Federal contributions; provide without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; maintain during the economic life of the project continued public ownership and administration for public use of the publicly owned shores upon which the recommended Federal participation is based; maintain at the Grosse Point Park Beach conditions that will exclude permanent human habitation including summer residences, preserve the natural protective features of the beach and inshore lands, and provide essentially full park facilities for appropriate public use including a suitable recreational beach all of which shall meet the approval of the Chief of Engineers; provide appurtenant facilities required for realization of recreational benefits; control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers; and obtain approval of the Chief of Engineers, prior to commencement of work,

of detailed plans and specifications, and arrangements for prosecuting the work. Local interests have indicated their willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Illinois: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The modification of the existing beach erosion project at Evanston consisting of steel sheet-pile groins and beach replenishment at two locations will provide needed shore protection.

Fort Pierce, Fla.

(H. Doc. 84, 89th Cong.)

Location.—The study area is located on a coastal barrier island fronting the Atlantic Ocean about 2 miles east of Fort Pierce, Fla., across Indian River.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—There is no Federal project for beach erosion control.

Problem.—The instability and recession of the shoreline due to deficiency of littoral material entering area and loss of material into offshore waters. The recession downcoast of the Federal navigation project jetties has accelerated since their construction by local interests in 1930.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Adoption of a project by the United States providing for reimbursement to the local cooperating agency of that part of the first costs of initial restoration and periodic nourishment for a period of 10 years of the two contiguous beaches as follows: One-half of such costs for that part of the reach of ocean shoreline starting at and extending 1.2 miles south of Fort Pierce Inlet which is in public ownership at the time of reimbursement; and 70 percent of such costs for the 0.1-mile ocean shoreline known as the Lions Club Park and located 6,310 feet south of Fort Pierce Inlet.

Estimated cost (price level of fall 1962)

Federal	$220,000
Non-Federal	205,000
Total	425,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$8,600	$8,800	$17,400
Beach nourishment	37,200	34,800	72,000
Total	45,800	43,600	89,400
Annual benefits:			
Prevention of loss of land			53,700
Prevention of damage to developments			3,400
Recreational			62,700
Total			119,800

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.3.

Local cooperation.—Obtain approval by the Chief of Engineers, prior to commencement of work on the project, of the detailed plans and specifications for the project and of arrangements for prosecuting the work; furnish at their own expense all other lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project; and furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that, during the economic life of the project, they will (1) maintain continued public ownership of the publicly owned shores and their administration for public use during the economic life of the project, or assure continued availability for public use of privately owned shores involved in the project where Federal aid is based on such use; (2) maintain at the Lions Club Beach Park conditions that will exclude permanent human habitation including summer residences, preserve the natural protective features of the beach and inshore lands, and provide essentially full park facilities for appropriate public use including a suitable recreational beach all of which shall meet with the approval of the Chief of Engineers; (3) provide periodic nourishment for preservation of the protective beach, as may be required to serve the intended purposes subject to Federal participation as recommended herein; and (4) control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to meet the terms of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Florida: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The improvement will correct the continuing erosion of the beach at Fort Pierce which has progressed in recent years to such an extent that its use is impaired and public improvements in the area are threatened with destruction.

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii

(H. Doc. 107, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Haleiwa Beach is on the northwest coast of the island of Oahu, about 31 miles northwest of Honolulu.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project for beach erosion control. Haleiwa Beach Park which fronts the beach is owned by the city and county of Honolulu.

Beach erosion control problem.—Haleiwa Beach has been deteriorating gradually.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Restoration and protection of the shore of Haleiwa Beach by artificial placement of beach fill and construction of an offshore breakwater and a groin.

Estimated cost (price level of June 1962)

Federal	$572,400
Non-Federal	381,600
Total	954,000

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$37,900
Maintenance and periodic beach nourishment	10,900
Total	48,800
Annual benefits:	
Damages prevented	1,000
Recreation	186,100
Total	187,100

Benefit-cost ratio.—3.8.

Local cooperation.—Maintain the protective measures; maintain continued public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use; maintain at Haleiwa Beach Park conditions that will exclude permanent habitation including summer residences; preserve the natural protective features of the beach and inshore lands; provide essentially full park facilities for public use; and control water pollution to safeguard health of bathers. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—Progressive destruction of Haleiwa Beach by wave erosion has resulted in a substantial recreational loss to the local community and the public at large. The improvement will provide necessary corrective measures.

Hunting Island Beach, S.C.

(H. Doc. 323, 88th Cong.)

Location.—Hunting Island is located along the southeastern shore of South Carolina in Beaufort County, 16 miles east of the city of Beaufort, 9 miles southwest of Edisto Beach, and 35 miles northeast of Tybee Roads at the mouth of the Savannah River.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—There is no existing Federal project.

Beach erosion control problem.—The beach at the study area is eroding rapidly and existing improvements are being threatened or destroyed by encroachment of the ocean. The high-water line along the beach front has receded 100 to 500 feet since 1948.

Recommended plan of improvement.—The plan comprises periodic nourishment of about 18,500 feet of beach on the northern part of the island with initial placement of a 3-year advance nourishment, and construction of one groin at the north end of the island. Federal participation in periodic nourishment would be limited initially to a period of 10 years.

Estimated cost (price level of 1962)

Federal	$319,000
Non-Federal	136,000
Total	455,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$12,000	$6,500	$18,500
Periodic nourishment	68,000	29,500	97,500
Total	80,000	36,000	116,000
Annual benefits:			
Land losses prevented			56,000
Damages prevented			12,000
Recreational			119,000
Total			187,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.6.

Local cooperation.—Contribute 30 percent of the first cost of the project construction, a sum currently estimated at $136,000, and agree that during the 10-year period following initial construction they also will contribute prior to the periodic nourishment work 30 percent of the costs thereof, a sum estimated at $29,500 annually; and furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that, during the economic life of these works, they will (1) provide, without cost to the Federal Government, all necessary lands, easements and rights-of-way for construction and nourishment of the project; (2) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages due to the construction and nourishment under the project; (3) control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers; (4) maintain for public use as a park and conservation area meeting the criteria for such areas as expressed in the River and Harbor Act of 1962, the portion of the park upon which the Federal participation is based; and (5) assure maintenance and periodic nourishment of the project as may be required to serve the intended purpose, subject to Federal participation as recommended herein. Local interests have indicated willingness and ability to comply with these provisions.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of South Carolina: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee notes that the improvement of the beaches along Hunting Island Beach would protect public property and preserve the existing recreation area.

Perth Amboy, N.J.

(H. Doc. 186, 89th Cong.)

Location.—City of Perth Amboy, Middlesex County, N.J.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—No Federal beach erosion project.

Beach erosion problem.—Consists of erosion of the beach in front of the existing seawall which will permit damage to property, including road and utility facilities and possible failure of sections of old bulkheads.

Recommended plan of improvement.—Construction of a 560-foot bulkhead.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1964)

Federal	$82,000
Non-Federal	82,000
Total	164,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$4,200	$4,200	$8,400
Maintenance		900	900
Total	4,200	5,100	9,300
Annual benefits:			
Shore protection			10,200
Enhancement			1,300
Total			11,500

Benefit-cost ratio.—1.2.

Local cooperation.—Bear all costs of the work in excess of the Federal contribution of $82,000; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; maintain all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; maintain during the economic life of the project continued public ownership and use of the present non-Federal publicly owned shores, and the private shores which are to be converted to public ownership, upon which the Federal participation is based; and obtain approval of the Chief of Engineers, prior to commencement of work, of detailed plans and specifications of the project.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

State of New Jersey: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee considers that this work is essential to alleviate the erosion problem.

Waikiki Beach, Oahu, Hawaii

(H. Doc. 104, 89th Cong.)

Location.—Waikiki Beach is located in Honolulu on the south shore of the island of Oahu. The study area comprises a shore frontage of about 2¼ miles from Diamond Head to Ala Wai Yacht Harbor.

Authority.—Section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended.

Existing project.—The existing Federal project provides for artificial placement of sand fill to widen the beach berm and construction of a terrace wall, two groins, and appurtenant drainage facilities. The State in 1957 built groins to assist in retaining sand fill.

Beach erosion control problem.—At one time a continuous beach existed along the shoreline. Usable beach area now exists only in scattered locations. Seawalls built at the beginning of the century interfered with natural onshore-offshore movement of sand resulting in sand being washed seaward and to other areas. Groin construc-

tion and sand placement have been used in attempts to reduce erosion and improve the beach areas. Some success has been obtained but the existing beaches are inadequate to meet public demand.

Recommended plan of improvement.—In lieu of existing project, provide for restoration and protection of the shore of Waikiki Beach by artificial placement of beach fill on the shore to widen the beach to widths of 75 to 180 feet, construction of eight new groins and appuretenant drainage facilities, and modification of three existing groins.

Estimated cost (price level of August 1963)

Federal	$2,490,000
Non-Federal	[1] 1,310,000
Total	3,800,000

[1] Includes $500,000 for construction of Kuhio Beach segment by State.

Project economics

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	$145,000
Maintenance and operation	46,000
Total	191,000
Annual benefits:	
Recreation	3,179,000
Reduction in maintenance	62,000
Total	3,241,000

Benefit-cost ratio.—17.9.

Local cooperation.—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; obtain approval by the Chief of Engineers prior to construction of plans and specifications for the Kuhio Beach segment; provide a contribution estimated at $1,310,000 in funds or equivalent work, either prior to initiation of construction or in increments in accordance with the construction program satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers, subject to final adjustment based on public use and ownership of the shore at time of construction and after actual costs have been determined; maintain continued public ownership or continuous availability of unobstructed public use of the shores upon which the amount of Federal participation is based and administration of those shores for public use, exclusively for bathing and water-related recreation; maintain project works except for beach fill on the Fort DeRussy frontage; and control water pollution to the extent necessary to safeguard the health of bathers. Local interests have indicated willingness to meet requirements of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies.—

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget.—No objection.

Remarks.—The committee recognizes that Waikiki Beach is a primary tourist attraction. Erosion has reduced the beach, which at one time was continuous along the shoreline, to mere patches of beach area which are entirely inadequate for the ever-increasing number of tourists. The improvement will correct these deficiencies.

SECTION 302

This section amends section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958. As amended this section provides for a comprehensive program for control and progressive eradication of obnoxious plant growths from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes. The program would be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. On the basis of a pilot project for study and control of obnoxious aquatic plants in the Southeastern United States, and the damage and inconvenience occurring in areas where such plants are prevalent, the committee is convinced of the need and practicability of the continuing nationwide program which would be established by this section. The committee intends that the term "other obnoxious plant growths" not be interpreted as excluding algae problems from the purview of this section.

The committee notes that the Tennessee Valley Authority has an existing program for the control of water milfoil and other obnoxious plants in the Tennessee River and its tributaries. The committee wishes to make clear that the aquatic plant control program of the Corps of Engineers authorized by this bill is not intended as a substitute for the TVA program. Since plant control activities in the Tennessee River system must be coordinated with the operation of the dams and reservoirs for flood control, navigation, and power generation, as well as for malaria control, TVA must retain responsibility for such activities in the Tennessee River Basin. It is anticipated, however, that TVA and the corps will cooperate to the fullest extent in promoting research and exchanging information on this problem.

Appropriation of not in excess of $5 million annually would be authorized to carry out the purposes of this section.

SECTION 303

This section would grant the consent of Congress for the State of Pennsylvania to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pa. This consent is given for the purpose of meeting that requirement of section 9 of the act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401). It is the intent of the committee that this grant of consent shall apply only to construction of an inflatable fabric dam. There would be no cost to the Federal Government.

SECTION 304

This section authorizes the Secretary of the Army to make surveys for navigation, beach erosion, and related purposes at localities specifically named in the bill.

SECTION 305

The existing project for the James River, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of October 23, 1962, provides for a deep-water channel from Hampton Roads to Richmond, Va., and appurtenant works. The authorizing legislation contains the provision that the

authorization shall expire after a period of 5 years from date of approval, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time. The Committee has been informed that the Commonwealth of Virginia has spent some $300,000 on a model study on the James River to determine the effect of the project on the fishery industry. Completion of the studies and analysis by the State cannot be accomplished within the 5-year period after authorization of the project. The committee is well aware of the work that the State of Virginia is doing and recognizes that due to the complexity of the problem that additional time for study and analysis is needed. The committee accordingly has granted the additional time required for analysis of the model study results, which should be completed before October 23, 1971.

SECTION 306

The Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (PIANC) is an international body concerned with engineering developments for inland waterways and ocean navigation. The committee notes that the present limit on appropriations for Federal participation in the Congresses is not sufficient to pay expenses under present conditions. In view of the importance of the Federal Government participating in this work, the committee believes that an authorization of up to $22,000 per year is warranted.

SECTION 307

The purpose of this section is to declare a certain section of the East River in New York City nonnavigable, so as to permit the development of the area for housing and other purposes.

The area in question lies between 17th and 30th Streets in Manhattan, at a place where the river makes a significant bend, creating an area of water outside the pierhead line. At the present time, the only structure in the area is a pier used to dock a boat used by the New York City Board of Education, which the city would presumably relocate. There is no navigation taking place in the area, and the Corps of Engineers has testified before this committee that it has no future use contemplated for the area.

In requesting this legislation, the city of New York stated that it desired the area to be used primarily for housing, including facilities for medical personnel of Bellevue Hospital. Shops, restaurants, and a marina would also be built. One portion of the area would be used as the site for a school for children of U.N. personnel. The present U.N. school occupies a site that has been condemned. Construction would take place on platforms supported by open piles, so as not to affect the navigable part of the East River Channel.

This declaration of nonnavigability withdraws the Federal Government's right to order the structures removed for purposes of navigation under the commerce clause of the Constitution without compensation. This will remove a cloud on the title, and allow local interests to make financial arrangements for the development of the area for useful purposes other than navigation. The section requires no expenditure of Federal funds.

SECTION 308

This section would declare the old channel of River Raisin, Monroe County, Mich., between the Monroe Harbor Range Front Light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, a nonnavigable stream. In addition the consent of Congress would be given for the filling in of the old channel of the River Raisin by the riparian owners on such channel.

In the act approved May 20, 1826 (4 Stat. 175), Congress authorized a survey of La Plaisance Bay, Mich., to ascertain the expediency of improving the navigation thereof, and the expense of effecting the same. At that time River Raisin, upon which Monroe, Mich., is located, was connected with the bay near its head, but the navigable waters of the river and bay were separated by extensive shoals. The town of Monroe was connected to the railhead at the river's mouth by about 4 miles of railroad. Congress appropriated money each year from 1826 to 1835 to construct and maintain a harbor of refuge at the railhead. During this same period a plan was considered for connecting the navigable waters of the River Raisin with La Plaisance Bay by dredging a meandering reach of the River Raisin that is now referred to as the "Old Channel." This plan was abandoned in favor of the more practical project of straightening the River Raisin by dredging a direct canal to Lake Erie. Congress appropriated money for this project in 1835 (4 Stat. 752) and the canal was placed in service in 1838. The "Old Channel" then ceased to have any commercial value and all plans for its improvement were abandoned. Over the years the "Old Channel" has gradually filled in and is actually obstructed by a sand bar at the La Plaisance Bay end. Much of it has become marshland and has merged with a wandering channel, known as Plum Creek, which is not considered to be a navigable water of the United States. The existing "Old Channel" restricts its use to shallow draft recreational craft. The filling of the "Old Channel" will not prevent small craft operating on Plum Creek from entering Lake Erie as that waterway is still open to La Plaisance Bay and Lake Erie.

The existing riparian owners wish to develop this site and to do so must fill the channel.

The committee believes that the "Old Channel" should be declared nonnavigable and the consent should be given for the filling of the channel by the riparian owners.

SECTION 309

The revision to section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958, Public Law 85–500 (72 Stat. 303) which would be made by this section is to clarify the authority conferred upon the Chief of Engineers in the alteration, relocation, or replacement of State and local governmental structures and facilities necessitated by development of river and harbor and flood control projects. Although the existing law vests in the Chief of Engineers authority to protect, alter, replace, reconstruct, or relocate existing structures or facilities owned by an agency of Government, there is no definition of this authority to guide the Chief of Engineers in his exercise of this authority.

The revision made by this section would more specifically define the authority of the Chief of Engineers by authorizing him to alter, relocate, or replace structures and facilities to such standards as he

deems reasonable, but not to exceed the minimum standards established by the State or the responsible political subdivision thereof for the type or category of facility involved except that in the case of an existing facility which exceeds minimum standards of the State of political subsdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a replacement facility of comparable standards.

For example, under this revision the Chief of Engineers can replace an existing school with a new facility that meets current space requirements based upon the current average pupil enrollment and other features to meet minimum State standards for accreditation of the newly constructed school.

The authority in the present law to make a lump-sum payment representing reasonable cost of relocation or replacement of a facility has been retained in this revision. It is intended that payment of the lump sum will be contingent upon construction of facilities necessary for continuation of the function and purpose served by the existing facility which is being taken by the Federal Government for project purposes.

SECTION 310

This section amends existing authority available to the Corps of Engineers to construct small navigation and beach erosion control projects without specific congressional authorization by increasing the current Federal cost limitations to $500,000 per project and the total appropriation for any one fiscal year to $10 million. The committee notes that the existing small project program provides a vehicle for expeditious construction of urgently needed and economically justified improvements. The committee considers that the increase in individual project cost limitations and the annual appropriations for such purposes will provide a desirable and needed extension of this program.

SECTION 311

In order to permit dredging to full project depth throughout the channel in Calumet Harbor and River prior to replacement of the Nickel Plate Railroad bridge, temporary protection of the center pier and south abutment is necessary, and the south abutment of Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad bridge needs strengthening. The committee believes that to require local interests to furnish temporary protection for the Nickel Plate bridge would impose a condition of local cooperation beyond those contemplated at the time of the project authorization, and in equity the Elgin bridge should be treated similarly. Therefore, section 311 would modify the project to authorize the Chief of Engineers to provide such protection at Federal cost.

SECTION 312

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army, to conduct a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor, and including, but not limited to the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. The section further provides that a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and

associated technical center shall be constructed, operated, and maintained in the State of Maryland for this purpose. Such model and center may be utilized by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. However, priority shall be given to the study authorized by this bill.

The committee recognizes the need and desirability of investigation to determine an effective basis for conservation, development, and use of the waters of Chesapeake Bay, including Baltimore Harbor, both with respect to immediate problems and as a basis for avoidance of problems likely to be attendant upon more intensive future use of the bay and harbor.

Authority is included for appropriation of not to exceed $8,500,000 to carry out the purposes of the section.

SECTION 313

This section is identical to H.R. 3788 passed by the House of Representatives on July 19, 1965. The purpose of the bill, the views of the committee, and the comments of the Federal agencies are all set forth in House Report 611, 89th Congress.

SECTION 314

This section is identical to H.R. 3976 passed by the House of Representatives on May 17, 1965. The purpose of the bill, the views of the committee, and the comments of the Federal agencies are all set forth in House Report 290, 89th Congress.

SECTION 315

This section directs the Secretary of the Army to transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for water resources development.

The committee believes that the development of water resource laws has accelerated to such a degree that it is necessary to initiate a study leading to possible revision and codification in order that this information may be readily available to those engaged in and concerned with water resource development, including the Congress, Federal, and State agencies and the general public. Since the Chief of Engineers is primarily concerned with the administration of these laws it is expected he will supervise this work.

SECTION 316

This section provides for study and recommendations to the Congress concerning the need and feasibility of the Federal Government reimbursing States and other public entities for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control,

and other purposes, subsequent to the initiation of studies which form the basis for such authorized projects.

SECTION 317

This section provides that title III may be cited as the River and Harbor Act of 1965.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS ON S. 2300

We generally support S. 2300, but we strongly oppose authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln School project, St. John River, Maine, and the hydroelectric features of the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, W. Va., and the Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Dams and Reservoirs, Flint River Basin, Ga.

Dickey-Lincoln School Project, St. John River, Maine

This project, as proposed by the Secretary of the Interior, would consist of a conventional hydroelectric power dam at the Dickey site and a downstream reregulating dam with power installation at the Lincoln School site, on the St. John River in Maine. The project would have an installed capacity of 794,000 kilowatts, and the annual power output is estimated to be 1,010 million kilowatt-hours at site and 938 million kilowatt-hours at market, after transmission losses. The Federal cost of the project that would be authorized by this bill is estimated to be $227 million. The associated transmission system to market power and energy from the project is estimated to cost an additional $73 million, bringing the total cost to $300 million.

We are opposed to authorization of this project for the following reasons:

1. *It is strictly a power project.*—This development is not being proposed for the purpose of discharging the traditional Federal responsibility for flood control or navigation. This is not a multiple-purpose project, primarily for flood control or navigation, that includes the development of power for realization of maximum benefits from the project. Only two-tenths of 1 percent of the benefits of this project will be flood control; whereas, the power benefits will be 97.8 percent. The remaining 2 percent will be area redevelopment benefits. There is no reason or justification for the Federal Government to spend up to $300 million of the taxpayers' money to construct a 98-percent power project, particularly when the future power needs of the area are being adequately provided for, as clearly shown by testimony before the committee.

2. *Studies of the project have been inadequate.*—The Dickey-Lincoln School project has been studied, and its construction has been planned, in connection with the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project. The plan for this power development, as set forth in a report to the Secretary of the Interior from the Passamaquoddy-St. John River Study Committee, entitled "Supplement to July 1963 Report—The International Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project and Upper St. John River Hydroelectric Power Development," dated August 1964, was submitted in 1964 to the affected Federal agencies and States for comment. These comments were so critical, and they so accurately exposed fundamental defects in the plan, that construction of the Passamaquoddy project had to be abandoned, for it is admittedly uneconomical. On July 9, 1965, the Secretary of the Interior sub-

mitted a proposal to the President for construction of the Dickey-Lincoln School portion of the project alone, as an independent development. The President's approval of this recommendation was announced the next day, and the proposal was immediately transmitted to the Congress. In the original plan, the Dickey-Lincoln School project was to provide pumping power for the pump turbines at Quoddy. No detailed studies have been made of this project to operate as a separate, independent unit, and no report on the present proposal has been submitted to the affected Federal agencies and States for comment, as required by law. Preparation and review of the report on this project should follow established procedures, the same as that required for all other projects, to assure that the project is justified before construction is authorized.

3. *No power marketing plans have been developed.*—The Secretary of the Interior bluntly stated, when he testified before the committee, that he had not discussed the marketing of power from this project with anyone. He further confirmed the fact that there are no plans in existence as to how, where, and at what prices power from this project will be marketed. The Secretary also stated that a new Federal agency, similar to the Southeast Power Administration or the Southwest Power Administration, would have to be created to market the power from this project.

The unusually complex and difficult problems of marketing an isolated large block of high cost power, as is present here, make marketing determinations an essential prerequisite to authorization of the project.

The taxpayers of the United States should not have to wait until the project is built, as is apparently proposed, to ascertain whether the project power can be sold at a price which will return its costs. It is plain foolhardy to spend $300 million to construct a facility when the salability of its products has not been established.

4. *It is questionable if power can be sold at a price sufficient to repay the cost of the project.*—Administration witnesses made much of their plan to sell load factor power to preference customers at about 7 mills per kilowatt-hour. However, they repeatedly brushed aside and refused to face up to the reality that if the project is to have any semblance of financial feasibility, even under the extremely liberal standards employed in computing repayment requirements, such sales would be possible only if the remaining low load factor power production were sold at extremely high, and at what almost certainly would be prohibitive, rates. Mr. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., staff engineer and staff counsel of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association, appeared as a witness at the committee hearings in support of this project, and he testified that the estimated annual power production cost for the Dickey-Lincoln School project is $14,600,000. It is simple arithmetic to ascertain that the average cost per kilowatt-hour of the annual production of the 938 million kilowatt-hours of power delivered to markets is $0.0155. Obviously power must be sold at least at this average rate to cover production and transmission costs. The marketing costs would have to be added to secure the overall wholesale rate, which, of course, does not include any provision for distribution costs.

Mr. Robinson also testified that the average rate for all power purchased by cooperatives in the State of Maine in 1964 was 13.9 mills per kilowatt-hour, and in Vermont it was 13.3 mills. It is diffi-

cult to see how this project could be attractive to cooperatives at an average price of 15½ mills per kilowatt-hour, when they are now purchasing power from private utility companies at a lower rate.

5. *There are cheaper alternatives that could bring lower cost power to New England.*—Representatives of the New England power companies proposed an alternative thermal power development, using nuclear energy, and pumped-storage, at an estimated cost of $71,040,000 for construction of the generating and transmission facilities, as compared with $300 million for the Dickey-Lincoln School project, including transmission facilities. These witnesses testified further that the annual cost of production of power at the alternate facility would be $10,680,000 including taxes, and $7,410,000 excluding taxes, which is compared with the estimated annual cost of $14,600,000 for the Federal project. The conclusion to be drawn from this testimony, that power can be produced more cheaply by an alternate facility, is confirmed by the August 1964 report of the Passamaquoddy-St. John River Study Committee to Secretary Stewart L. Udall, entitled, "Supplement to July 1963 Report—The International Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project and Upper St. John River Hydroelectric Development," and the July 9, 1965, report of Secretary Stewart L. Udall to President Johnson entitled, "Conservation of the Natural Resources of New England—The Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project and the Upper St. John Hydroelectric Development." For example, the 1964 report, on page 81, states:

> Federally constructed and operated pumped-storage projects could produce equivalent peaking power at a lower cost than the Passamaquoddy-Upper St. John River project.

The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in his letter of November 18, 1964, to Secretary Stewart L. Udall, which letter is included in the 1965 report, said, in reference to the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project and Upper St. John Hydroelectric project—

> * * * the report does indicate that with similar financing conditions, equivalent power could be produced more economically by either fossil or nuclear powerplants. Whether federally or privately financed these steamplant alternatives would initially cost around one-fifth of the cost of the proposed hydro project.

It seems clear that more dependable power can be produced more cheaply, more efficiently, where and when required, and of the type needed (peaking or load factor power) by an alternative thermal generating facility, using nuclear energy, and pumped-storage, than by the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project.

Furthermore, cheaper power can be provided by such alternate facility without spending one penny of tax money to provide the investment capital for construction of the project or to finance the annual subsidy represented by the difference between the 4¼-percent interest rate paid by the Government for money currently borrowed and the 3⅛-percent collected by the Government in the power rate for interest. Such a privately developed power facility would also pay taxes to help bear the cost of all levels of government, National, State, and local.

Construction of the Dickey-Lincoln School project is neither in the public interest nor in the interest of the ultimate consumers of power from the project.

Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, W. Va.

Authorization of the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir on the Cheat River in West Virginia provides for the construction of a multipurpose dam and reservoir for flood control, water quality control, recreation, and hydroelectric power production at an estimated Federal cost of $133,548,000.

In its comments concerning the project, the Bureau of the Budget took note of the fact that there was pending before the Federal Power Commission an application by the Monongahela Power Co. for a preliminary permit relating to the development of hydroelectric power at the Rowlesburg project. Under these circumstances, the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the hydroelectric power features described in the project report not be authorized for Federal construction at this time. It was stated that further consideration of Federal development should be deferred pending completion of action on the application by the Federal Power Commission. The Secretary of the Army concurred in the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

S. 2300, as passed by the Senate and as reported by the House Committee on Public Works, would authorize the entire project, including the hydroelectric power features, but with the following provisos:

> *Provided*, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further*, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further*, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

This authorization is not in accordance with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, as concurred in by the Secretary of the Army, for Federal construction of the hydroelectric power features would be authorized even though it is a conditional authorization. To comply with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, the project should be approved without the pumped-storage power development features, which would reduce the estimated Federal cost of the project to $88,402,000. Efforts were made in the Committees on Public Works to approve the project in this manner, but a majority of the committee voted to approve the project as it was authorized by the Senate.

On August 17, 1965, after passage of S. 2300 by the Senate, the Federal Power Commission acted favorably upon the application of the Monongahela Power Co., referred to by the Bureau of the Budget. The Federal Power Commission granted a 24-month preliminary permit to the company to study a proposed pumped-storage hydro-

electric plant on the Cheat River at Rowlesburg, W. Va. It was stated in the comments of the Bureau of the Budget, before the Federal Power Commission acted:

> Should the Commission act favorably, it would be expected that the power company would undertake the power development within a reasonable period of time. Should the Commission act unfavorably on the application or should the power company fail to undertake the power development within a reasonable period of time, consideration could then be given to whether the power features should be authorized for Federal development.

Under the circumstances, it seems obvious that authorization of the hydroelectric power features of the project should be deleted and that the project should be authorized without the pumped-storage power development, at an estimated Federal cost of $88,402,000, which would result in an initial saving of $45,146,000 to the taxpayers of the Nation. There is simply no justification for authorizing Federal construction of the hydroelectric power features of this project, however conditionally, when private power interests are taking active measures to construct this project through private investment instead of at taxpayers' expense.

Flint River Basin, Ga.

The President has advocated a closer partnership between Government and private enterprise and a reduction in unnecessary governmental expenditures. The proposal for a joint Federal-private development of the Flint River Basin, Ga., by the Federal Government and a private power company, will promote these objectives, as well as having many other advantages. If the administration and the Congress are sincere in their pronouncements to eliminate unnecessary governmental expenditures and to create a closer partnership between Government and business, then S. 2300, as reported, should be amended to provide for such a joint development of the Flint River Basin.

In 1962, the Chief of Engineers recommended a comprehensive plan for development of the Flint River, which plan included construction of the Spewrell Bluff, Lazer Creek, and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Dams and Reservoirs in the headwaters, for flood control, hydroelectric power generation, general recreation and fishing recreation, and two other projects, primarily for navigation, below Albany, Ga. This general plan was approved by Congress in 1963, and construction of the Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir only was authorized at that time. Planning funds for the Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir are included in the President's fiscal year 1966 budget.

S. 2300, as reported by the Committee on Public Works, would authorize the other two headwater projects, Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Dams and Reservoirs, at an estimated Federal cost of $88,653,000. The total estimated cost of these two projects and Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir is $156,455,000, of which $52,000,000 is for construction of the hydroelectric power features.

An amendment was offered in committee to provide that a private power company may construct, own, operate, and maintain the

hydroelectric power facilities at each of these three reservoirs if, within 2 years after the date of enactment of this legislation, the Federal Power Commission licenses such company to do so in accordance with the Federal Power Act and other applicable provisions of law, and fixes, in accordance with section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act, the charges to be paid by the licensees for use of the dam so as to reimburse the Federal Government for project costs allocated to power during the period of time of the license. The operation and maintenance of such hydroelectric power facilities by a private power company would be in accordance with rules and regularions prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. This amendment was rejected by a majority of the committee.

The Georgia Power Co. has made a firm offer in hearings before the committee to build, maintain, and operate powerhouses, and incidental facilities at the three dams under FPC license and in a manner satisfactory to the Corps of Engineers. The company would make annual payments which would fully repay the Government for the project costs allocated to power.

Both the present and immediately past Governors of the State of Georgia have gone on record as favoring a joint project. The U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins, has recommended a joint Federal-private venture. Local interests have given overwhelming support for joint development.

In a letter dated August 18, 1965, to the chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, the Resource Advisory Board of the Southeast River Basin, stated:

> The Resource Advisory Board advocates development of the three dam and reservoir projects proposed on the Flint River at Spewrell Bluff, Lazer Creek, and Lower Auchumpkee Creek as joint Federal-private ventures. * * * The Resource Advisory Board endorses the recommendations of the U.S. Study Commission and urges the Congress to authorize the three named Flint River projects for joint construction and operation by the Federal Government and the Georgia Power Co.

Joint construction of these three projects would result in a reduction in the Federal investment of $52 million. Furthermore, independent auditors have estimated that joint projects at these three sites would generate over the 50-year period of the projects approximately $41 million in additional Federal income taxes. In addition, the company would pay the Government an estimated $2.3 million annually for use of the dams.

In addition to the taxes which would accrue to the Federal Government, the State, counties, and school districts would also benefit. State income taxes attributable to the private portion of the projects over the 50-year period are estimated to be $4.5 million, and State and county ad valorem taxes are estimated at $20.5 million.

Federal construction of power generating facilities at the Spewrell Bluff, Lazer Creek, and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Dams and Reservoirs is not warranted. Private investment, in cooperation with the

Federal Government, can accomplish the purpose with many additional public advantages.

WILLIAM C. CRAMER.
JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr.
WILLIAM H. HARSHA.
JOHN C. KUNKEL.
JAMES R. GROVER, Jr.
JAMES C. CLEVELAND.
DON H. CLAUSEN.
CHARLES A. HALLECK.
CHARLOTTE T. REID.
ROBERT C. McEWEN.
JAMES D. MARTIN.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN FRANK M. CLARK, PENNSYLVANIA

I am not opposed to enactment of S. 2300 for enactment of such legislation for the improvement of our river basins and watersheds is certainly essential to the progress of the Nation. I do, however, object to the inclusion of one project—the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the St. John River in Maine.

I have every desire to assist the New England States in obtaining legitimate assistance from the Federal Government in their quest for lower power rates. I feel quite simply though that the Interior Department and Corps of Engineers has not proven the economic feasibility of this project within the usual criteria established by the Congress. In effect the agencies of the Government have not done their job; they have not provided the information the Congress needs to make an intelligent decision. The fact that there has been considerable opposition to the project from the very area that is supposed to benefit from this project, and this opposition includes some Congressmen from the area, the electric companies of the region and the New England Council, would seem to indicate that this one takes a lot more examination before we authorize the expenditure of such a large amount of money—in actuality some 10 percent of the total omnibus bill.

The Members can understand my objections when it is considered that one basic criteria established for such projects is that there is no better alternate way of doing the job. This is not truly a flood control or reclamation project, but is some 95 percent power. Its stated objective is to help reduce the cost of power in the area. There is more than ample evidence in the committee hearings record to raise serious questions about that. There is further evidence that the private companies of the region can do the job better, faster, and cheaper without the expenditure of any Federal funds. In fact, the Federal project might actually retard the primary objective of lower power costs when it has been stated that consumers will be receiving a 40-percent reduction in power costs from nuclear and fossil-fuel plants tied to pumped-storage stations.

The utility companies up there say that they will be producing power, and in some instances already are, at lower cost than this project will be able to do a half decade or more from now. This indicates to me a serious question about the thoroughness of the examination of alternate method. I am saying that this particular project deserves considerably more examination before the Congress takes action on it.

I suggest further that, at the very least, there should be some marketing arrangements made in advance for this power before an authorization is made. There are clear statements in the record from utility companies in the area that they will not be interested in buying the power at the projected Interior Department rates because they will be too high.

It seems to me that the close division of the members of the Public Works Subcommittee and the heavy barrage of unfavorable editorial comment from the region to be affected, and the opposition of some of the Members from that area, plus the tremendous amount of money involved could only lead us to return the project to the committee for closer scrutiny.

One purpose that closer scrutiny would serve would be to resolve the apparent contradictions in testimony concerning the present and future power costs of the region. In a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Albert A. Cree, representing most of the electric companies in the region, predicted the 40-percent reduction in power prices between now and 1980. The letter went on to say:

> Mr. Dunham, president of Central Maine Power Co., stated that the average cost of power from that system presently sold to wholesale customers was about 11.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. With this estimated 40-percent reduction between now and 1980 or earlier, this wholesale price would drop to 6.9 mills, which is below the lowest price quoted for preference customers in Maine in the report of July 9, 1965, by Secretary of the Interior Udall to the President.

With this being the case how can we support the expenditure of such a mammoth amount of money for a project that will produce power that is more costly than that produced by private companies for only one-quarter the cost? For $300 million we will buy for the taxpayers an electric project located 400 miles from the load centers of the region that will be unable to produce as much power in a year as the small Yankee Atomic Electric Co. plant at Rowe, Mass., which was built for only $40 million.

There is no question but that this project will give a temporary, but only temporary, boost to the State of Maine through the expenditure of millions of dollars there. But the question that is raised, based on what we now know about this project, is, Cannot better things be done for Maine? It has been clearly established that for this project to be economically feasible it has to be considered on a New England-wide basis. It is not enough to say that it will do nothing for New England but in actual fact it will have several bad effects. First off, it will not help reduce electric costs but will have a contrary effect. Secondly, it will slow down the scheduled construction of large, efficient thermal plants in other parts of New England—both nuclear and conventionally fueled plants.

So now we are asking the taxpayers to spend a minimum of $300 million and not reduce power costs of one region and discourage the construction of large, taxpaying plants in that same area.

The bad effects on New England is one problem, but there are bad effects on other parts of the country too. The Congressmen from the coal and oil producing areas are being asked to saddle their constituents with additional Federal expenditures which will reduce the sale of coal and oil and will not help anyone at all. Competition we can stand but hardly so when it is a project, federally subsidized, to produce power that is high in cost in an already high cost area and will have adverse effects elsewhere in the land.

There are many unanswered questions on this particular project. I am not sure that we are ever going to get the answers to them. But I am sure that until we make a try at getting the information that we do not now have, we should not support any requests for authorization of this project.

FRANK M. CLARK,
Member of Congress.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

THE PARAGRAPH UNDER THE CENTER HEADING "RED RIVER BASIN" IN THE ACT OF DECEMBER 30, 1963 (77 STAT. 840, PUBLIC LAW 88–253)

RED RIVER BASIN

The Waurika Dam and Reservoir on Beaver Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 33, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,100,000: *Provided,* [That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir] *That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to acquire lands and interests therein required for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir as described in Senate Document Numbered 33, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $418,000, whenever the Secretary of the Interior approves the establishment of such a refuge.*

ACT OF SEPTEMBER 14, 1961

(75 Stat. 509)

AN ACT To authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to amend any lease entered into [before November 1, 1956,] providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of commercial recreational facilities at a water resource development project under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army so as to provide for the adjustment, either by increase or decrease, from time to time during the term of such lease of the amount of rental or other consideration payable to the United States under such lease, when and to the extent he determines such adjustment or extension to be necessary or advisable in the public interest. No adjustment shall be made under the authority of this Act so as to increase or decrease the amount of rental or other consideration payable under such lease for any period prior to the date of such adjustment.

SECTION 206(b) OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a)

(b) The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations hereafter made for flood control, sums not to exceed [$1,000,000] *$2,500,000* in any one fiscal year for the compilation and dissemination of such information.

SECTION 104 OF THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1958, AS AMENDED

[SEC. 104. That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive project to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, at an estimated additional cost for the expanded program over that now underway of $1,350,000 annually for five years, of which 70 per centum, presently estimated at $945,000, shall be borne by the United States and 30 per centum, presently estimated at $405,000, by local interests, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, published as House Document Numbered 37, Eighty-fifth Congress: *Provided*, That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from such operations and participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of the additional program: *Provided further*, That Federal funds appropriated for this project shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.]

SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian water milfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocatsd by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.

SECTION 101 OF THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1962

(Public Law 87–874)

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation of flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

NAVIGATION

* * * * * * *

James River, Virginia: House Document Numbered 586, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $39,000,000: *Provided*, That this authorization shall expire [after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time] *October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date: And provided further*, That prior to construction, there will be submitted to the Congress a feasibility report which takes account of possible adverse effects of the project on seed oyster production;

* * * * * * *

SECTION 107 OF THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1948

(62 Stat. 1174)

SEC. 107. That not to exceed [$5,000] *$22,000* annually of the funds appropriated for rivers and harbors shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment in amounts approved by the Chief of Engineers of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meetings of the congresses and of the Commission.

SECTION 111 OF THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1958 (72 STAT. 303)

SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental func-

tion should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (*1*) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable [actual cost of such remedial work, or for the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost: *Provided,* That this] *cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This* section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of [the date of this Act] *July 3, 1958,* and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States.

SECTION 107 OF THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577)

SEC. 107. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot from any appropriations hereafter made for rivers and harbors not to exceed [$2,000,000] *$10,000,000* for any one fiscal year for the construction of small river and harbor improvement projects not specifically authorized by Congress which will result in substantial benefits to navigation and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of the waters of the Nation for other purposes, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable, if benefits are in excess of the cost.

(b) Not more than [$200,000] *$500,000* shall be allotted for the construction of a project under this section at any single locality and the amount allotted shall be sufficient to complete the Federal participation in the project under this section.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 3 OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 13, 1946

(33 U.S.C. 426g)

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to undertake construction of small shore and beach restoration and protection projects not specifically authorized by Congress, which otherwise comply with section 1 of this Act, when he finds that such work is advisable, and he is further authorized to allot from any appropria-

tions hereafter made for civil works, not to exceed [$3,000,000] *$10,000,000* for any one fiscal year for the Federal share of the costs of construction of such projects: *Provided*, That not more than [$400,000] *$500,000* shall be allotted for this purpose for any single project and the total amount allotted shall be sufficient to complete the Federal participation in the project under this section including periodic nourishment as provided for under section 1(c) of this Act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of local cooperation specified in section 1 of this Act shall apply: *And provided further*, That the work shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation, except for participation in periodic beach nourishment in accordance with section 1(c) of this Act, and as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of survey reports.

Act of December 21, 1944, as Amended

AN ACT Creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Illinois

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the City of Clinton Bridge Commission (hereinafter created, and hereinafter referred to as the "commission"), and its successors and assigns be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Illinois, at a point or points suitable to the interest of navigation, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this Act. For like purposes said commission, or its successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to acquire by purchase or condemnation, and to reconstruct, maintain, and operate all or any existing bridges for vehicular traffic crossing the Mississippi River at or near the city of Clinton, Iowa, and may acquire control of any or all such existing bridges by purchase of stock in any corporation owning any such bridges, or by a conveyance from such corporation and in any case the existing right or rights of the city of Clinton to acquire any such bridge or bridges shall be merged into and represented by acquisition thereof by the commission, and said commission shall be authorized to maintain and operate said bridge or bridges subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this Act: *Provided*, That the power granted in this Act with respect to the acquisition and purchase of any bridge shall not be exercised by said commission until all terms of the proposed acquisition and purchase of any such bridge shall have been approved by the Highway Departments of the States of Iowa and Illinois.

Sec. 2. Jurisdiction of all condemnation proceedings under this Act for the acquisition of any existing bridge or bridges is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, and for such purpose the process of such court may be served outside of the State or district in which such court is located.

Such proceedings shall follow as nearly as may be the law of the State of Iowa governing the proceedings for the condemnation of private property for public purposes in said State. Copies of any final judgment, decree, or order of such court in any such condemnation proceedings relating to land located outside said district shall be filed with the clerk of the court of the Federal district in which such land is located. In any such condemnation proceedings the commission shall be authorized to condemn all right, title, and interest in the bridge or bridges and approaches, and all right, title, and interest in real property necessary therefor.

SEC. 3. There is hereby conferred upon the commission and its successors and assigns the right and power to enter upon such lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such privately owned real estate and other property in the State of Iowa and the State of Illinois as may be needed for the location and construction of any such bridge or bridges and for the operation and maintenance of any bridge and its approaches hereby authorized to be acquired or constructed, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purpose by said State, respectively. The commission, its successors and assigns, is further authorized to enter into agreements with the States of Illinois and Iowa, and any political subdivision thereof, for the acquisition, lease, or use of any lands or property owned by such State or political subdivision.

SEC. 4. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge or bridges in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and as provided by the Act of Congress approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 5. (*a*) The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge, or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate [connection] *connections* with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 per centum per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this Act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be [registered] *registrable* as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed twenty-five years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges, acquired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for the use of said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not

exceeding 105 and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. *Subject to the provisions of any prior contracts or obligations the commission may disburse any available bridge revenues or other funds or borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges under this Act and acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, provided that all notes evidencing the funds so borrowed, if not previously paid from such bridge revenues, shall be repaid from the proceeds of the bonds of the commission when issued for account of such new bridge or bridges. In the event the commission issues notes as hereinbefore in this section provided and said notes have not been otherwise paid and a new bridge or bridges are not built, said notes shall be paid from revenues derived from the operation of any other bridge or bridges owned by the commission, subject to the obligation of payment of all outstanding indebtedness for which said revenues have been theretofore pledged.* The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refinance any outstanding [bonds at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption: *Provided*, That such refunding bonds shall mature within not to exceed twenty-five years from the date thereof and shall not exceed in principal amount the principal amount of outstanding bonds replaced by such refunding bonds.] *bonds, and to pay any other indebtedness of the commission, at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption, and may include, as a part of an issue of bonds to provide for the cost of a bridge to be constructed under this Act, sufficient additional bonds bearing interest at a rate or rates not exceeding 6 per centum per annum to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption.* The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

(*b*) [Said] *Such* bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for [four] *at least two* consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for twelve months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural,

traffic surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises and riparian rights relating to the bridge, *as well as the cost of abandonment or dismantlement of any existing bridge to be replaced thereby.* If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter provided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery.

SEC. 6. The rates and schedule of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge or bridges, in accordance with the Act of Congress approved March 23, 1906, shall be continuously adjusted and maintained so as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge or bridges and approaches under economical management, and to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of all or any thereof redeemed or repurchased before maturity as herein provided. All tolls and other revenues from said bridge or bridges are hereby pledged to such uses and to the application thereof as hereinafter in this section required. After payment or provision for payment therefrom of all such cost of maintenance, repair, and operation, and the reservation of an amount of money estimated to be sufficient for the same purpose during an ensuing period of not more than six months, the remainder of tolls collected shall be placed in a fund, at intervals to be determined by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds, to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge or bridges and approaches; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The commission shall classify in a reasonable way all traffic over the bridge or bridges so that the tolls shall be so fixed and adjusted by it as to be uniform in the application thereof to all traffic falling within reasonable classes, regardless of the status or character of any person, firm, or corporation participating in such traffic, and shall prevent all use of such bridge or bridges for traffic except upon payment of tolls so fixed and adjusted. No toll shall be charged officials or employees of the Commission, nor shall toll be charged officials of the Government of the United States, while in the discharge of duties incident to their office of employment, nor shall toll be charged members of the fire department or peace officers when engaged in the performance of their official duties.

Within a reasonable time after the construction of any bridge or bridges, or the acquisition of any bridge or bridges, the commission shall file with the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency [1] a sworn itemized statement showing the cost of constructing or purchasing the bridge or bridges and their approaches, the cost of acquiring any interest in real or other property necessary therefor, and

[1] Functions of Public Roads Administration transferred from Federal Works Agency to Department of Commerce by Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949.

the amount of bonds, debentures, or other evidence of indebtedness issued in connection with the construction or acquisition of said bridge or bridges.

SEC. 7. Nothing herein contained shall require the commission or its successors to maintain or operate any presently existing bridge or bridges acquired hereunder, if and when all bonds issued for account of such bridge or bridges shall have been retired or provision for the payment of interest on and the retirement of such bonds from the revenues from any other bridge or bridges shall have been made at the time of issuance of such bonds. Any such presently existing bridge or bridges so acquired and any appurtenances and property thereto connected and belonging, may be sold or otherwise disposed of or may be abandoned or dismantled whenever in the judgment of the commission or its successors, and subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads, Federal Works Agency,[2] and the United States Secretary of the Army it may be declared expedient so to do and provisions with respect to and regulating any such sale, disposal, abandonment, or dismantlement may be included in proceedings for the issuance and sale of bonds for account of any such bridge or bridges. The commission and its successors may fix such rates of toll for the use of such bridge or bridges as it may deem proper subject to the same conditions as are hereinabove required as to tolls for traffic over the bridge to be constructed provided tolls shall be fixed and revised from time to time for traffic over all bridges so as not to adversely reflect upon the earnings of any bridge or bridges for account of which bonds may be outstanding. An accurate record of the cost of acquiring or constructing each such bridge; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 8. (a) After payment of the [bonds and interest,] *bonds, the notes issued under section 5 of this Act, and the interest*, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment shall have been provided and shall be held solely for that purpose, the commission shall deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the commission in and to that part of said bridge or bridges within Iowa to the State of Iowa or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereafter referred to as the "Iowa interests"), and that part of said bridge or bridges within Illinois to the State of Illinois or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereafter referred to as the "Illinois interests"), under the condition that the bridge or bridges shall thereafter be free of tolls and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the Iowa interests and the Illinois interests, as may be agreed upon; but if the Iowa or Illinois interests, as the case may be, fail to accept, or are not authorized to accept their respective portions of said bridge or bridges, then the commission may deliver deeds, or other suitable instruments of conveyance of said portions, to any other interest which may accept and may be authorized to accept the same, under the condition that the bridge or bridges shall thereafter be free of toll and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by said interests to whom said conveyances are delivered, but if either the Iowa interests, or the Illi-

[2] Functions of Commissioner of Public Roads transferred from Federal Works Agency to Department of Commerce by Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949.

nois interests, or any other interest hereinabove mentioned shall not be authorized to accept or shall not accept the same under such conditions, then the bridge or bridges shall continue to be owned, maintained, operated, and repaired by the commission as a free bridge, until such time as the Iowa interests, the Illinois interests, or any other interest hereinabove mentioned, shall be authorized to accept and shall accept such conveyance under such conditions. The rate or rates of toll for crossing any bridge now existing or hereafter constructed which abuts upon or enters into the corporate limits of the city of Clinton, Iowa, shall not be reduced below the rate or rates now in effect on existing bridges so long as any indebtedness of said commission for the account of any bridge or bridges shall be outstanding and unpaid. Before deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance are offered to the Iowa interests and the Illinois interests for acceptance, the commission shall place the bridge or bridges in a state of repair which will meet the approval of the Highway Departments of the States of Iowa and Illinois, and in the opinion of said highway departments said bridge or bridges will need repainting within two years after the date of conveyance of title, the commission shall turn over to the Iowa interests and the Illinois interests sufficient funds to pay the cost of repainting.

(b) Notwithstanding any restrictions or limitation imposed by the Act entitled "An Act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, or by the Federal Highway Act, or by an Act amendatory of or supplemental to either thereof, the Federal Works Administrator [3] or any other Federal department or agency of the United States Government may extend Federal aid under such Acts for the construction of said bridge or bridges out of any moneys allocated to the State of Iowa with the consent of the State highway commission of said State, and out of moneys allocated to the State of Illinois with the consent of the department of highways of said State.

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this Act, there is hereby created the City of Clinton Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession; may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or property and apply same to the purposes of this Act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this Act.

The commission shall consist of Thomas B. Charlton, Joseph J. Burke, Fred Hansen, Mark Morris, and Milton Peaco, of Clinton, Iowa, and a representative from the highway department of each of the States of Iowa and Illinois, such representative from Iowa to be designated by the State Highway Commission of Iowa and such representative from Illinois to be designated by its Division of Highways, Department of Public Works and Buildings; such commission shall be a public body corporate and politic, but is hereby declared not to be an agency of the Federal Government. Of the members of

[3] Functions of Federal Works Administrator relating to the Public Roads Administration transferred to the Secretary of Commerce by Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949.

the commission hereinabove named, Thomas B. Charlton and Joseph J. Burke shall be for a term of one year each, Fred Hansen and Mark Morris shall be for a term of two years each, and Milton Peaco shall be for a term of three years, from the date of approval of this Act, and thereafter each member appointed on the commission shall be for a term of three years, except when such appointment is to fill an unexpired term. Each member of the commission shall qualify within thirty days after the approval of this Act by filing in the office of the Federal Works Administrator [4] an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by this Act, and each person appointed to fill a vacancy shall qualify in like manner within thirty days after his appointment. Any vacancy in said commission other than of members to be designated by the highway departments of Iowa and Illinois, occurring by reason of failure to qualify as above provided, or by reason of death, expiration of term, or resignation, shall be filled by the Federal Works Administrator.[4] Before the issuance of bonds as hereinabove provided, each member of the commission shall give such bond as may be fixed by the Commissioner of Public Roads, Federal Works Agency,[5] conditioned upon the faithful performance of all duties required by this Act; the cost of such surety prior to and during the construction of the bridge shall be paid or reimbursed from the bond proceeds and thereafter such costs shall be deemed an operating expense. The commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from its members, and may establish rules and regulations for the government of its own business. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 10. The commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenues and receipts thereof shall be applied to the purposes specified in this Act. The members of the commission shall be entitled to a per diem compensation for their services of $10 for each day actually spent in the business of the commission, but the maximum compensation of the chairman in any year shall not exceed $1,200, and of each other member shall not exceed $600. The members of the commission shall also be entitled to receive traveling expense allowance of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the commission. The commission may employ a secretary, treasurer, engineers, attorneys, and other such experts assistants, and employees as they may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such reasonable compensation as the commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this Act. After all bonds and interest thereon shall have been paid and all other obligations of the commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payment shall have been made as hereinbefore provided, and after the bridge or bridges shall have been conveyed to the Iowa interests, and the Illinois interests, as herein provided, or otherwise disposed of as provided herein, the commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have further existence by an order of the Commissioner of public roads [6] made upon his own initiative or upon application of the commission or any member or members thereof, but only after a public hearing in the city of Clinton, Iowa, notice of the time and

[4] See footnote 3, supra.
[5] See footnote 2, supra.
[6] See footnote 2, supra.

place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once, at least thirty days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in the city of Clinton, Iowa. At the time of dissolution all moneys in the hands of or to the credit of the commission shall be divided into two equal parts, one of which shall be repaid to said Iowa interests and the other to said Illinois interests.

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Act, the commission shall have full power and authority to negotiate and enter into a contract or contracts with the State Highway Commission of Iowa and the Department of Highways of Illinois, the city of Clinton, Clinton County, Iowa, or any county or municipality in the State of Illinois, whereby the commission may receive financial aid in the construction or maintenance of the bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, and said commission in its discretion may avail itself of all of the facilities of the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa and the Department of Highways of the State of Illinois with regard to the construction of said proposed bridge or bridges, and the commission may make and enter into any contract or contracts which it deems expedient and proper with the State Highway Commission of Iowa and the Department of Highways of Illinois, whereby said highway departments or either of them may construct, operate, and maintain or participate with the commission in the construction, operation, and maintenance of said bridge or bridges and approaches to be constructed hereunder. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of Congress to facilitate the construction of a bridge and proper approaches across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Illinois, and to authorize the commission to promote said object and purposes, with full power to contract with either the State Highway Commission of Iowa or the Department of Highways of Illinois, or with any agency or department of the Federal Government, or both, in relation to the purchase or condemnation, construction, operation, and maintenance of said bridges and approaches.

SEC. 12. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize or permit the commission, or any member thereof, to create any obligation or incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from funds contemplated to be provided by this Act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this Act shall be a personal obligation or liability of any member or members of the commission, but shall be chargeable solely to the funds herein provided, nor shall any indebtedness created pursuant to this Act be an indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 13. The design and construction of any bridge which may be built pursuant to this Act shall be in accordance with the standard specifications for highway bridges adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, and the location and design of any such bridge shall be subject to approval by the highway departments of the States of Iowa and Illinois.

SEC. 14. Any bridge or bridges constructed, acquired, or reconstructed under authority of this Act shall be constructed, maintained, and operated in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906. By reason of the commission hereinbefore created being a public body the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and any

amendments to either or both of said Acts, shall not apply to bonds authorized to be issued by this Act.

SEC. 15. The bridge or bridges purchased or constructed under the authority of this Act shall be deemed to be Federal instrumentalities for interstate commerce, the postal service, and military and other purposes authorized by the Government of the United States, and said bridge or bridges and the income derived therefrom shall, on and after the effective date of this section, be exempt from all Federal, State, municipal, and local property and income taxation.

SEC. 16. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

ACT OF JULY 26, 1956, AS AMENDED

AN ACT Creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Muscatine Bridge Commission (hereinafter created, and hereinafter referred to as the "commission"), and its successors and assigns be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Rock Island County, Illinois, at a point or points suitable to the interest of navigation, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this Act. For like purposes said commission, or its successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to acquire by purchase or condemnation, and to reconstruct, maintain, and operate any existing bridge for vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic crossing the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and may acquire control of any such existing bridge by purchase of stock, in any corporation owning any such bridge, or by a conveyance from such corporation, or by purchase or conveyance of any interest in such bridge from an individual, partnership, company, or other legal entity which might have ownership in such bridge, and in any case the existing right or rights, if any, of the city of Muscatine, Iowa, to acquire any such bridge shall be merged into and represented by acquisition thereof by the commission and said commission shall be authorized to maintain and operate said bridge subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this Act: *Provided*, That the power granted in this Act with respect to the acquisition and purchase of any bridge shall not be exercised by said commission until all terms of the proposed acquisition and purchase of any such bridge shall have been approved by the highway departments of the States of Iowa and Illinois.

SEC. 2. Jurisdiction of all condemnation proceedings under this Act for the acquisition of any existing bridge is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, and for such purpose the process of such court may be served outside of the State or district in which such court is located. Such proceedings shall follow as nearly as may be the law of the State of

Iowa governing the proceedings for the condemnation of private property for public purposes by said State. Copies of any final judgment, decree, or order of such court in any such condemnation proceedings relating to land located outside said district shall be filed with the clerk of the court of the Federal district in which such land is located. In any such condemnation proceedings the commission shall be authorized to condemn all right, title, and interest in the bridge or bridges and approaches, and all right, title, and interest in real property necessary therefor.

SEC. 3. There is hereby conferred upon the commission and its successors and assigns the right and power to enter upon such lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such privately owned real estate and other property in the State of Iowa and the State of Illinois as may be needed for the location and construction of any such bridge or bridges and for the operation and maintenance of any bridge and its approaches hereby authorized to be acquired or constructed, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purpose in said State, respectively. The commission and its successors and assigns are further authorized to enter into agreements with the States of Illinois and Iowa, and any political subdivision thereof, for the acquisition, lease, or use of any lands or property owned by such State or political subdivision. The commission and its successors and assigns are further authorized to enter into agreement with the United States of America, or any of its agencies, for the acquisition, lease, or use of any lands or property owned by or under the jurisdiction of the United States or its agencies.

SEC. 4. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 per centum per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this Act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be registered as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed thirty years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges acquired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not exceeding 105 per centum of the face value and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission

prior to the issuance of the bonds. The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption: *Provided*, That such refunding bonds shall mature within not to exceed thirty years from the date thereof and shall not exceed in principal amount the principal amount of outstanding bonds replaced by such refunding bonds. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission, in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

Said bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for four consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for twelve months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic-surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of riparian rights relating to the bridge. If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter provided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery.

SEC. 5. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge or bridges in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and as provided by the Act of Congress approved March 23, 1906, as amended or supplemented. The rates and schedule of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge or bridges shall be adjusted from year to year and maintained so as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge or bridges and approaches under efficient management, and to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of all or any thereof redeemed or repurchased before maturity as herein provided. All

tolls and other revenues from said bridge or bridges are hereby pledged to such uses and to the application thereof as hereinafter in this section required. After payment or provision for payment therefrom of all such cost of maintenance, repair, and operation, and the reservation of an amount of money estimated to be sufficient for the same purpose during an ensuing period of not more than six months, the remainder of tolls collected shall be placed in a fund, at intervals to be determined by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds, to pay the principal and interests of such bonds. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge or bridges and approaches; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The commission shall classify in a reasonable way all traffic over the bridge or bridges so that the tolls shall be so fixed and adjusted by it as to be uniform in the application thereof to all traffic falling within reasonable classes, regardless of the status or character of any person, firm, or corporation participating in such traffic, and shall prevent all use of such bridge or bridges for traffic except upon payment of tolls so fixed and adjusted. No toll shall be charged officials or employees of the commission, nor shall toll be charged officials of the Government of the United States while in the discharge of duties incident to their office or employment, nor shall toll be charged members of the fire department or peace officers when engaged in the performance of their official duties.

Within a reasonable time after the construction of any bridge or bridges, or the acquisition of any bridge or bridges, the commission shall file with the Commissioner of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, a sworn itemized statement showing the cost of constructing or reconstructing or purchasing the bridge or bridges and their approaches, the cost of acquiring any interest in real or other property necessary therefor, and the amount of bonds, debentures, or other evidence of indebtedness issued in connection with the construction or reconstruction or acquisition of said bridge or bridges.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein contained shall require the commission or its successors to maintain or operate any presently existing bridge acquired hereunder, if and when all bonds issued for account of such bridge shall have been retired or provision for the payment of interest on and the retirement of such bonds from the revenues from any other bridge shall have been made at the time of issuance of such bonds. Any such presently existing bridge so acquired and any appurtenances and property thereto connected and belonging, may be sold or otherwise disposed of or may be abandoned or dismantled whenever in the judgment of the commission or its successors, and subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads, and the Secretary of the Army, it may be declared expedient so to do, and provisions with respect to and regulating any such sale, disposal, abandonment, or dismantlement may be included in proceedings for the issuance and sale of bonds for account of any such bridge. The commission and its successors may fix such rates of toll for the use of such bridge as it may deem proper, subject to the same conditions as are hereinabove required as to tolls for traffic over the bridge to be constructed, provided tolls shall be fixed and revised from time to time for traffic over all bridges so as not adversely reflect upon the earnings of any bridge or bridges for account of which bonds may be outstand-

ing. An accurate record of the cost of acquiring or constructing each such bridge; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 7. (a) After payment of the bonds and interest, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment shall have been provided and shall be held solely for that purpose, the commission shall deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the commission in and to that part of said bridge or bridges within Iowa to the State of Iowa or any municipality or agency thereof authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereafter referred to as the "Iowa interests"), and that part of said bridge or bridges within Illinois to the State of Illinois or any municipality or agency thereof authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereafter referred to as the "Illinois interests"), under the condition that the bridge or bridges shall thereafter be free of tolls and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the Iowa interests and the Illinois interests, as may be agreed upon; but if the Iowa or Illinois interests, as the case may be, fail to accept, or are not authorized to accept, their respective portions of said bridge or bridges, then the commission may deliver deeds, or other suitable instruments of conveyance of said portions, to any other interest which may accept and may be authorized to accept the same, under the condition that the bridge or bridges shall thereafter be free of toll and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the interests to whom said conveyances are delivered; but if either the Iowa interests, or the Illinois interests, or any other interest hereinabove mentioned shall not be authorized to accept or shall not accept the same under such conditions, then the bridge or bridges shall continue to be owned, maintained, operated, and repaired by the commission as a toll bridge, tolls to be charged being reduced so as to provide only such money as may be necessary to pay maintenance, operators expense, and repairs, until such time as the Iowa interests, the Illinois interests, or any other interest hereinabove mentioned shall be authorized to accept and shall accept such conveyance under such conditions. The rate or rates of toll for crossing any bridge now existing or hereafter constructed or reconstructed which abuts upon or enters into the corporate limits of the city of Muscatine, Iowa, shall not be reduced below the rate or rates now in effect on existing bridges so long as any indebtedness of said commission for the account of any bridge or bridges shall be outstanding and unpaid. Before deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance are offered to the Iowa interests and the Illinois interests for acceptance, the commission shall place the bridge or bridges in a state of repair which will meet the approval of the highway departments of the States of Iowa and Illinois, and if in the opinion of said highway departments said bridge or bridges will need repainting within two years after the date of conveyance of title, the commission shall turn over to the Iowa interests and the Illinois interests sufficient funds to pay the cost of repainting.

(b) Notwithstanding any restrictions or limitation imposed by the Act entitled "An Act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, the Commissioner of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, or any other Federal department or agency of the United States Government may

extend Federal aid under such Act for the acquisition, reconstruction, or construction of said bridge or bridges out of any moneys allocated to the State of Iowa with the consent of the State highway commission of said State, and out of moneys allocated to the State of Illinois with the consent of the department of highways of said State.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this Act, there is hereby created the Muscatine Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession; may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or property and apply same to the purposes of this Act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this Act.

The commission shall consist of L. R. McKee, E. W. Boynton, H. W. Ogilvie, G. J. Volger, and C. A. Rehwaldt, and a representative from the highway department of each of the States of Iowa and Illinois, such representative from Iowa to be designated by the State Highway Commission of Iowa and such representative from Illinois to be designated by its division of highways, department of public works and buildings; such commission shall be a public body corporate and politic, but is hereby declared not to be an agency of the Federal Government. Of the members of the commission hereinabove named, L. R. McKee and E. W. Boynton shall serve for a term of three years each, H. W. Ogilvie and C. A. Rehwaldt for a term of four years each, and G. J. Volger for a term of five years, from the date of approval of this Act, and thereafter each member appointed on the commission shall be for a term of five years, except when such appointment is to fill an unexpired term. Each member of the commission shall qualify within thirty days after the approval of this Act by filing with the secretary of the commission an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by this Act, and each person appointed to fill a vacancy shall qualify in like manner within thirty days after his appointment. Any vacancy in said commission, other than of members to be designated by the highway departments of Iowa and Illinois, occurring by reason of failure to qualify as above provided, or by reason of death, expiration of term, or resignation, shall be filled by two-thirds majority vote of the remaining members of the commission or by the Iowa State Highway Commission in the event the remaining members of the bridge commission are unable to agree upon such appointment within a period of ninety days from the date the vacancy occurred. Before the issuance of bonds as hereinabove provided, each member of the commission shall give bond in the sum of $10,000: *Provided*, That the chairman, and the secretary and the treasurer if they are members of the commission, shall give bond of $25,000 each conditioned upon the faithful performance of all duties required by this Act; the cost of such surety prior to and during the acquisition of the existing bridge or the reconstruction or the construction of a bridge shall be paid or reimbursed from the bond proceeds and thereafter such costs shall be deemed an operating expense. Bonds of the commission members shall be filed with the secretary of the commission. The commission shall annually elect from its members a chairman and a vice chairman, who shall each serve until his

successor is elected, and may establish rules and regulations for the government of its own business. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 9. The commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenues and receipts thereof shall be applied to the purposes specified in this Act. The members of the commission shall be entitled to a per diem compensation for their services of $20 for each day actually spent in the business of the commission, but the maximum per diem compensation of the chairman in any one year shall not exceed $3,000, and the maximum annual per diem compensation of each other member shall not exceed $2,000. The members of the commission shall also be entitled to receive traveling expense allowance of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the commission. The commission shall employ a secretary and may employ a treasurer, engineers, attorneys, and other such experts, assistants, and employees as they may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such reasonable compensation as the commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this Act. After all bonds and interest thereon shall have been paid and all other obligations of the commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payment shall have been made as hereinbefore provided, and after the bridge or bridges shall have been conveyed to the Iowa interests, and the Illinois interests, as herein provided, or otherwise disposed of as provided herein the commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have further existence by an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa made upon application of the commission or upon application of any other party in interest, but only after a public hearing in the city of Muscatine, Iowa, notice of the time and place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once, at least thirty days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in the city of Muscatine, Iowa. At the time of dissolution all money in the hands of or to the credit of the commission shall be divided into equal parts, one of which shall be paid to said Iowa interests and the other to said Illinois interests, or to any other interest to which the bridge or bridges is conveyed.

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Act, the commission shall have full power and authority to negotiate and enter into a contract or contracts with the State Highway Commission of Iowa and the Department of Highways of Illinois, or any governmental entity in the State of Illinois or the State of Iowa, or any nongovernmental group in the State of Iowa or any nongovernmental group in the State of Illinois or the United States Government or any agency or department thereof, whereby the commission may receive financial aid, or any other aid, in the acquisition and maintenance of an existing bridge and approaches and appurtenances thereto; or the reconstruction or construction of a bridge and approaches and appurtenances thereto.

The said commission may avail itself of all the facilities of the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa and the Department of Highways of the State of Illinois, or any subdivision of either State, or any department or agency of the United States Government, with regard to the acquisition of the existing bridge or the

reconstruction or construction of a bridge. The commission may make and enter into any contract or contracts which it deems expedient and proper with the State Highway Commission of Iowa, or the Department of Highways of Illinois, or any governmental agency, department, or subdivision of either or both States, or the United States Government or any department or agency thereof, whereby they or any of them may, by contract, participate with the commission in the financing, acquisition, operation, and maintenance of an existing bridge and the approaches and appurtenances thereto, or may participate with the commission in the financing, reconstruction or construction, operation, and maintenance of a bridge and approaches and appurtenances thereto. It is hereby declared to be the ultimate desire and purpose of Congress to facilitate the construction of a bridge and proper approaches and appurtenances thereto across the Mississippi River at or near Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Rock Island County, Illinois, and to empower the Muscatine Bridge Commission to promote said object and purpose. The powers given to the commission shall be broadly construed so that the ultimate desire and purpose of Congress may be fulfilled, which will facilitate interstate commerce, facilitate the postal service, and provide modern adequate bridge facilities for the military and promote national defense and security.

SEC. 11. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize or permit the commission or any member thereof to create any obligation or incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from funds contemplated to be provided by this Act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this Act shall be a personal obligation or liability of any member or members of the commission, but shall be chargeable solely to the funds herein provided, nor shall any indebtedness created pursuant to this Act be in indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 12. The design and construction of any bridge which may be built pursuant to this Act shall be in accordance with the standard specifications for highway bridges adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, and the location and design of any such bridge shall be subject to approval by the highway departments of the States of Iowa and Illinois.

SEC. 13. Any bridge or bridges constructed, acquired, or reconstructed under authority of this Act shall be constructed, maintained, and operated in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, as amended or supplemented. By reason of the commission hereinbefore created being a public body the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and any amendments to either or both of said Acts, shall not apply to bonds authorized to be issued by this Act.

SEC. 14. The bridge or bridges purchased or constructed under the authority of this Act shall be deemed to be Federal instrumentalities for interstate commerce, the postal service, and military and other purposes authorized by the Government of the United States, and said bridge or bridges and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from all Federal, State, municipal, and local property and income taxation.

SEC. 15. The Commission and its successors and assigns are authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois, subject to the provisions of this Act; except that the authority granted by this section shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of such bridge is commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 16. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

○

Union Calendar No. 418

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2300

[Report No. 973]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 28, 1965
Referred to the Committee on Public Works

SEPTEMBER 9, 1965
Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

~~TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS~~

~~SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accord-~~

ance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

NAVIGATION

Weymouth Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts; House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House

Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered 226, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,112,000;

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House

Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000: *Provided,* That in order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $563,000;

~~Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;~~

~~Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;~~

~~Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;~~

~~West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;~~

~~Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;~~

~~Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000: *Provided*, That any funds appropriated for the construction of this project shall not be utilized until such time as the Indiana dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by Act of Congress.~~

~~Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;~~

~~San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000;~~

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington: Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $676,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Num-

bered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

BEACH EROSION

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,400;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

SEC. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, or in other sections of this Act, subsequent to the initiation of the studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of October 23, 1962 (Public Law 874, Eighty-seventh Congress), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act: *Provided further*, That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects herein adopted: *And provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other projects of higher priority for improvements.

SEC. 103. That section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section

104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to reads as follows:

SEC. 104. (a) That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian water milfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies: *Provided*, That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations: *Provided further*, That costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section may be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be

necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: *Provided,* That any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

SEC. 104. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation

and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

SEC. 106. Title I of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Con-

gress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers

in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided,* That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further,* That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further,* That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

SAINT JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John

River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $277,000,000.

HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Still River at Danbury, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,300,000.

The project for flood protection on the Housatonic and Naugatuck Rivers at Derby, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,800,000.

NEW ENGLAND-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

LONG ISLAND SOUND AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

NEW YORK-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered ——, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

NEUSE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

FLINT RIVER BASIN

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,275,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items: *Provided*, That said projects shall be prosecuted within the monetary authorization made available for the comprehensive plan.

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

SOUTH ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

PHILLIPPI CREEK BASIN, FLORIDA

The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at a cost not to exceed $181,109,100, and the authorization for the lower Mississippi River project is hereby increased accordingly: *Provided*, That this authorization shall not be made available for the prosecution of any

projects except those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress: *Provided further,* That any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928: *And provided further,* That the pumping plant in the Red River Backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $56,922,000.

OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

RED RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and Tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

GULF OF MEXICO

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with

the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,290,000.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of

operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt

Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and Tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000: *Provided,* That such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $278,635,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the

recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Devils Jumps Reservoir, Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $151,000,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided,* That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further,*

That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further,* That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000: *Provided,* That prior to initiation of construction the Department of the Army will prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000: *Provided,* That local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for flood protection on the Iowa River at Marshalltown, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,670,000.

The project for flood protection on the Cedar River at Waterloo, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,900,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eight Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Maumee River at and in the vicinity of Findlay, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the

Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 158, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,317,000.

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief

of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

EEL RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,030,000.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

SEC. 204. (a) In the prosecution of improvements of rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such improvements are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or any subsequent similar Act requiring the designation of an area by the Secretary of Commerce as a condition of such assistance, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects within such areas.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction: *Provided*, That in the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and: *Provided further*, That the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related re-

sources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie: *Provided,* That such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided,* That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless author-

ized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

~~The Rio Grande River and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.~~

~~Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.~~

~~The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.~~

~~The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.~~

~~Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drains directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coast lines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.~~

~~Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.~~

~~Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.~~

~~SEC. 208. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".~~

TITLE I—NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby recognizes that assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to prepare a plan to meet the long-range water needs of the Northeastern United States. This plan shall provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of (1) a system of major reservoirs to be located within those river basins of the Northeastern United States which drain into the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into the Atlantic Ocean north of the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into Lake Ontario, and those that drain into the Saint Lawrence River, (2) major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest, and (3) major purification facilities. Such plan shall provide for appropriate financial participation by the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other local interests.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the

Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain those reservoirs, conveyance facilities, and purification facilities, which are recommended in the plan prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and which are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of the plan established in accordance with this section.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single and multiple purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10,000,000. No appropriation shall be made to construct, operate, or maintain any such project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Secretary shall

transmit to Congress a report of such proposed project, including all relevant data and all costs.

(b) Any water resource development project authorized to be constructed by this section shall be subject to the same requirements of local cooperation as it would be if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10,000,000 or more.

SEC. 202. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law, the authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 203. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of

December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 204. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the

Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

SAINT JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

The projects for flood protection on the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers at Derby and Danbury, Connecticut, are hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

NEW ENGLAND-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

LONG ISLAND SOUND AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

HUDSON RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at Yonkers, Saw Mill River, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 258, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,924,000.

NEW YORK-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in

House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

NEUSE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substan-

tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

FLINT RIVER BASIN

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

SOUTH ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers

in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

PHILLIPPI CREEK BASIN, FLORIDA

The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $181,109,000, and the authorization for the lower Mississippi River project is hereby increased accordingly, except that (1) any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, Floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928, (2) the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, (3) the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and (4) the

requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be the same as is required by paragraph (q) under the heading "LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The project for the St. Francis River, Missouri and Arkansas, within Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,372,000.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of

Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army in that document shall apply with respect to the Seabrook Lock feature of the project. The estimated cost is $56,235,000.

OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

RED RIVER BASIN

The proviso in the paragraph under the center heading "RED RIVER BASIN" in the Act of December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 840, Public Law 88-253) relating to the Waurika project, Oklahoma, is amended to read as follows: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to acquire lands and interests therein required for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir as described in Senate Document Numbered 33, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $418,000, whenever the Secretary of the Interior approves the establishment of such a refuge.".

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized

substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

The project for Sanders, Big Pine. and Collier Creeks, Texas, as authorized in the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1187), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway crossing Pat Mayse Reservoir to replace the present FM Highway 1499 across Sanders Creek, at an estimated cost of $310,000. Such crossing shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

GULF OF MEXICO

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,004,000.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkan-

sas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 270, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

The project for flood protection at Little Rock, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 55, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $363,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of

Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

The project for flood protection on Crutcho Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 47, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,801,000.

The project for Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colorado, House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-fourth

Congress, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in paragraph 2(a) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 1954, published in said document, local interests shall maintain the channel of Purgatoire River through the city of Trinidad. The conditions set forth in paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of said report shall be applicable to the project.

The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of

the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate

Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000, except that such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, shall be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the James River and tributaries, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 266, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,083,000.

The project for flood control on the Fishing River and

tributaries, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,260,000.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $218,009,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of Linneus Reservoir on Locust Creek, St. Catherine Reservoir on East Yellow Creek, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, nor hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonsburg Reservoir on Grand River.

The project for flood protection on the Platte River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 262, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,889,000.

The project for flood protection on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297; Public Law 85–500) is hereby modified to waive the requirement that local interests contribute in cash 2.16 per centum of the actual construction cost of all items of work provided by the United States.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Hocking River, Ohio, in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,520,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the

recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: Provided, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: Provided further, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: And provided further, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construc-

tion of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000. Prior to initiation of construction the Secretary of the Army shall prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Roseau River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House

Document Numbered 282, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,550,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000, if local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in

House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for Ames Dam and Reservoir, Skunk River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 267, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,893,000.

The projects for flood protection at Marshalltown and Waterloo on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $17,570,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

The project on the Des Moines River for flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, House Document Numbered 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified to eliminate the requirement recommended in paragraph 10(a)(2) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 13, 1943, that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Num-

bered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Enginers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000, except that the development of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

EEL RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House

Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

The project for the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir with supplemental channel improvements, Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 259, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000. The estimated cost is $3,442,000.

SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,750,000.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-

ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000, except that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work done by such interests on such project after the date of enactment of this Act, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The projects for the Lower Grande Ronde and Catherine Creek dams and reservoirs, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, Oregon, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 280, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,440,000. The Chief of Engineers shall construct, operate, and maintain such projects.

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

The project for acquisition of additional lands for waterfowl management at John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $706,000, except that the parcels of land,

in Oregon, between the Columbia River and the management area boundary within sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of Township 4 North, Range 25 East, Willamette Meridian, as shown on plate 1 of Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, estimated at 611.02 acres, shall not be part of the management area, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase such additional lands in sections 22, 27, 29, and 30, Township 5 North, Range 26 East, Willamette Meridian, outside the present indicated management area boundary on plate 1, as he determines necessary to replace the lands so excluded.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. In the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, the Federal Government shall not construct such local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, until said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that (1) it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with

the plan set forth in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and (2) that such reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. Such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enchancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improve-

ments, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf

of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coast lines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana (water supply).

Boyer River, Iowa.

Keokuk, Iowa.

Mississippi River, north of Dubuque, Iowa.

Black Hawk Creek, Iowa.

Mount Vernon, Indiana.

Orange Lake Basin, Florida.

Mayfield Creek, Kentucky.

Hatchie River and Tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.

Spoon River, Illinois.

Grand (Neosho) River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Verdigris River, Kansas.

Verdigris River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Sanderson, Texas.

Abbeville, South Carolina.

All streams which drain directly to Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, California.

Big Mineral Creek, Texas, particularly with reference to construction of a highway bridge.

Irondequoit Creek, New York, and tributaries, including Allens Creek, New York.

Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California to determine advisability of protection work against storm and tidal waves.

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding the first proviso in section 201 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes", approved May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), the authorization in section 204 of such Act of projects for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Washington, shall expire on June 10, 1970, unless local interests shall before such date furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required local coooperation in such project will be furnished.

SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of their contract numbered DA–41–443–eng–939 with Hill County, Texas, which are subject to flooding; such roads being a part of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, at an estimated cost of $130,000.

SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, subject to the

provisions of this section, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the tract of land lying above elevation 454 feet mean sea level now occupied by such Society at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under a lease executed by the Secretary of the Army and dated February 10, 1958.

(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be made upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and upon such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States. In determining the fair market value of the property, the Secretary shall exclude the value of any improvements made by or at the expense of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(c) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized by this section shall be borne by the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(d) Title to the property authorized to be conveyed by this section shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 211. The authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, West Virginia, hereafter shall be known and designated as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which the authorized Justice Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

SEC. 212. In recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Washington, by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such project and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by him approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army. Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the project for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army

pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890). Unless construction of the project is undertaken within three years from the date of enactment of this section, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

SEC. 213. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with the State of New York, political subdivisions thereof, and appropriate agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins within the State of New York, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate participation by the Department of the Army in carrying out such plans.

SEC. 214. The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities at reservoir areas", approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509), is hereby amended by striking out "before November 1, 1956,".

SEC. 215. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, an investigation and study of San Francisco Bay, California, including San Pablo

Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto, with a view toward determining the feasibility of, and extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes.

SEC. 216. The Secretary of the Army shall pay to any bona fide lessee or permittee owning improvements, which are or which were totally situated or partially situated on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of such improvements, which have been or will be rendered inoperative or be otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kansas, as determined by the Secretary, or by the United States District Court for the District of Kansas on which is conferred jurisdiction for this purpose. In no case shall the owner of such improvements receive dual compensation for any part of said improvements as a result of this section or otherwise. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide the funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this section from any moneys appropriated for the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project.

SEC. 217. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California,

to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $3,000,000.

SEC. 218. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to accept orders from other Federal departments and agencies for work or services and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

SEC. 219. Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500,000".

SEC. 220. The Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.

SEC. 221. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

TITLE III—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 301. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

NAVIGATION

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

Rondout Harbor, New York: House Document Num-

bered 288, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 274, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,090,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers—Removal of Drift in the Washington Metropolitan Area: House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered

187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Documents Numbered 226 and 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,569,000. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, shall include facilities to mitigate damages to presently improved areas southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of $40,000. The Chief of Engineers may include additional facilities to mitigate damages to additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge if he determines them to be necessary and justified, at an estimated additional cost of $60,000. All such facilities to mitigate damages shall be maintained by local interests.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000. In order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $570,000, except that the modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, contained in letter of April 5, 1965, from the Department of the Army to the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, shall apply with respect to recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 269, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,840,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

The project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public

Law 86–645; 74 Stat. 480) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct a steel bulkhead at cut numbered 1. Local interests shall contribute to the cost of the project an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of this project that would have been required for cut numbered 1, but for this modification.

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. In view of the willingness of the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a deep-draft public harbor in that vicinity, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such a harbor according to a design agreed upon by the Secretary of the Army and the State of Indiana, subject to the following conditions: (1) The amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with the State of Indiana, and approved by the President; (2) such amount shall not exceed the cost to the United States of constructing an equivalent Federal harbor at the same site; (3) prior to the time that the monetary

contribution, or any part thereof, is made available to the State of Indiana the Secretary of the Army and the State of Indiana shall have entered into an agreement providing for the operation of the harbor essentially as it would be operated by the Secretary of the Army had it been constructed as a Federal harbor; (4) no fees or tolls shall be charged for entrance to the outer harbor; (5) any other fees or charges collected by the State of Indiana shall not be used to cover any part of the contribution made by the Federal Government under this Act; (6) any funds appropriated under this authorization shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army and made available to the State of Indiana over the period of construction in proportion to the proposed annual expenditures of the State for construction of the outer harbor; and (7) at least sixty days prior to the date on which the Secretary of the Army makes available to the State of Indiana the initial installment of the monetary contribution authorized by this Act, he shall submit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives a letter report setting forth the basis for his determination under clause (1) above. Unless construction of the harbor is initiated within five years from the date of the enactment of this Act, the authority for the monetary contribution contained in this paragraph shall expire. Neither this paragraph nor the construction authorized by this paragraph shall adversely

affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana dunes as a national lakeshore.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas: House Document Numbered 257, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $470,000;

Trinity River and tributaries, Texas: House Document Numbered 276, Eighty-ninth Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and there is hereby authorized $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000. The works for wavewash protection within the limits of the modified San Joaquin River navigation project shall be repaired or restored by the United States as determined to be necessary by the Secretary of the Army over the life of the project.

Crescent City Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 264, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,980,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests on such project after August 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

BEACH EROSION

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Duval County, Florida: House Document Numbered 273, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,266,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 81, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,000;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

SEC. 302. Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasion watermilfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the

Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

SEC. 303. The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 304. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his

recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

Lake Dauterive and Chareton Floodgate, Louisiana.

Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

Manchester Harbor, Washington.

Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.

Calumet River, Illinois.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, from about mile 29 West of Harvey Lock to U.S. Highway No. 90 in vicinity of Boutte, Louisiana.

Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Withlacoochee River, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the project, with particular reference to provision for a side channel or connecting channel improvement through Cross Bayou to Old Tampa Bay, in the vicinity of Howard Frankland Bridge, for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

San Francisco County, California (beach erosion).

Lake Michigan Shoreline, Milwaukee County, Michigan (beach erosion).

Indian River County, Florida (beach erosion).

SEC. 305. The first proviso in the paragraph which begins "James River, Virginia:" in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–874) is amended

by striking out "after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date".

SEC. 306. Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1174) is amended by striking out "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$22,000".

SEC. 307. That portion of the East River, in New York County, State of New York, lying between the south line of East Seventeenth Street, extended eastwardly, the United States pierhead line as it existed on July 1, 1965, and the south line of East Thirtieth Street, extended eastwardly, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

SEC. 308. The old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Michigan, lying between the Monroe Harbor range front light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, is declared to be not a navigable stream of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given for the filling in of the old channel by the riparian owners on such channel.

SEC. 309. Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 303) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (1) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable

standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of July 3, 1958, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States."

SEC. 310. (a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended by striking out "$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

(2) Subsection (b) of such section 107 is amended by striking out "$200,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(b) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended (1) by striking out "$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000", and (2) by striking out "$400,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any project under contract for construction on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 311. The project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is modified in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost (1) such protection for the Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway bridge over the Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet, (2) such temporary protection for the center pier and the south abutment of the New York, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad bridge (Nickel Plate) as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south bridge draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet prior to its replacement, and (3) such modification of the channel limits as is necessary to insure full use of each such draw.

SEC. 312. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including, but not limited to, the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control,

control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. Such model and center may be utilized, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. The study authorized by this section shall be given priority.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $8,500,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 313. (a) The Act approved December 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 846), authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges, including approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Illinois, is hereby revived and reenacted. This section (including the amendments made by this section) shall be null and void insofar as it authorizes the construction of a bridge or bridges unless actual construction thereof be commenced

within three years and completed within five years from the date of the enactment of this section.

(b) Section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge, or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connections with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 per centum per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this Act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed twenty-five years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount

thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges, acquired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for the use of said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not exceeding 105 and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. Subject to the provisions of any prior contracts or obligations the commission may disburse any available bridge revenues or other funds or borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges under this Act and acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, provided that all notes evidencing the funds so borrowed, if not previously paid from such bridge revenues, shall be repaid from the proceeds of the bonds of the commission when issued for account of such new bridge or bridges. In the event the commission issues notes as hereinbefore in this section provided and said notes have not been otherwise paid and a new bridge or bridges are not built, said notes shall be paid from revenues derived from the operation of any other bridge or bridges owned by the commission, subject to the

obligation of payment of all outstanding indebtedness for which said revenues have been theretofore pledged. The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds, and to pay any other indebtedness of the commission, at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption, and may include, as a part of an issue of bonds to provide for the cost of a bridge to be constructed under this Act, sufficient additional bonds bearing interest at a rate or rates not exceeding 6 per centum per annum to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies

of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

"(b) Such bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for at least two consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for twelve months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises and riparian rights relating to the bridge, as well as the cost of abandonment or dismantlement of any existing bridge to be replaced thereby. If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter pro-

vided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery."

(c) Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act of December 21, 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "the bonds and interest," and inserting in lieu thereof: "the bonds, the notes issued under section 5 of this Act, and the interest,".

(d) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved.

SEC. 314. The Act entitled "An Act creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois", approved July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669), as amended by the Act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59), is amended by inserting immediately after section 14 the following new section:

"SEC. 15. The Commission and its successors and assigns are authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River

at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois, subject to the provisions of this Act; except that the authority granted by this section shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of such bridge is commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of enactment of this section."

SEC. 315. The Secretary of the Army shall transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and related water resources development. The Secretary shall also submit a report explaining the proposed legislation, and making specific reference to each change in or omission of any provision of existing law.

SEC. 316. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall make a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, the Federal Government reimbursing States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public entities, for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and other water resources development purposes, to the extent that such expenditures are

incurred after the initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for such authorized projects. The Secretary shall report to Congress, not later than January 31, 1967, the results of such study together with his recommendations in connection therewith.

SEC. 317. Title III of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

Passed the Senate July 27, 1965.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

Secretary.

Union Calendar No. 418

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2300

[Report No. 973]

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

JULY 28, 1965

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

SEPTEMBER 9, 1965

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Sept. 17, 1965
For actions of Sept. 16, 1965
89th-1st; No. 171

CONTENTS

Air pollution.....4	Food additives.....21	Public works.....7
Appropriations.....5,14,26	Food prices.....12	Reclamation.....6,16,36
Balance of payments.....25	Foreign aid.....11,32,35	Roads.....8,17
CCC.....5,40	Foreign trade.....2	Small business.....38
Claims.....39	Forestry.....9	Stockpiling.....23
Cotton.....31	Information.....18	Sugar.....1
Education.....20	Irrigation.....19	Trading stamps.....12,13
Expenditures.....27	Lands.....19	Transportation.....3
Farm labor.....28	Legislative program..14,26	Water resources.....22
Farm program.....34	Military construction...40	Weights and measures....15
Fats and oil.....2	Personnel.....10,33	Wheat.....30
Flood control.....37	Population.....29	Wildlife.....24
Food.....29	Public Law 480.....25	

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee voted to report sugar bill. Rep. Talcott criticized Labor Dept's farm labor policies. Rep. Todd inserted article re problem of food relationship to enlarging populations. Rep. Chamberlain inserted article favoring 50-50 shipping provision on wheat shipments to Russia.

HOUSE

1. SUGAR. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 10496, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948. p. D930

2. FOREIGN TRADE. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7969, to correct certain errors in the U. S. Tariff Schedules (pp. 23180-4). The bill includes a provision for duty-free treatment for machines with photoelectric sensing

devices for the sorting, on the basis of color only, of beans, peas, nuts, or similar agricultural products.

Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5768, to extend for an additional three years, until Nov. 7, 1968, the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of silk yarn, and to provide for a study of the feasibility of separate classifications for yarns of man-made fibers commonly referred to as textured of texturized yarns. p. 23180

The Ways and Means Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6568, to amend the Tariff Act so as to provide for alteration of the duties on the importation of copra, palm nuts, and palm nut kernels, and the oils therefrom (H. Rept. 1012). p. 23210

3. TRANSPORTATION. Received the conference report on S. 1588, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation (H. Rept. 1017). pp. 23187-9

4. AIR POLLUTION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 306, to amend the Clean Air Act and to provide for the establishment of a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory. p. 23211

5. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 10323, which includes funds to repay CCC for certain family housing projects financed from foreign currencies (H. Rept. 1018). pp. 23199-200

6. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2020, to authorize construction of the southern Nevada water project (H. Rept. 1011). p. 23210

7. PUBLIC WORKS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 2300, to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works for rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. p. 23211

8. ROADS. A subcommittee of the Public Works Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 11050, to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway system. p. D931

9. FORESTRY. The "Daily Digest" states that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) "H. R. 10198 (subcommittee discharged), to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act of 1916." pp. D930-1

10. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 969, to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants, and H. J. Res. 569, to require a cost-of-living survey to be made before the cost-of-living allowance for Federal employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands be reduced. p. D931

Rep. Nelson stated that "the principle of a nonpartisan, politically insulated Federal employee system must be retained" in D. C. if it is granted home rule. pp. 23193-4

11. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Saylor urged a reexamination of the foreign aid program to determine if it "should not be terminated once and for all after the current fiscal year." pp. 23195-6

89TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 1021

CONSIDERATION OF S. 2300

SEPTEMBER 16, 1965.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 588]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 588, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

House Calendar No. 170

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 588

[Report No. 1021]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 16, 1965

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. It shall be in

order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill, and read by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

House Calendar No. 170

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 588

[Report No. 1021]

RESOLUTION

Providing for consideration of S. 2300, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

By Mr. YOUNG

SEPTEMBER 16, 1965

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
ASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
FFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
INFORMATION ONLY;
TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Sept. 22, 1965
For actions of Sept. 21, 1965
89th-1st; No. 174

CONTENTS

Animal research.....27
Appropriations.....14
CCC.....14
Conservation.....25
Data processing.....22
Economics.....7
Education.....19
Electrification.....10
Elmer Thomas.....6
Farm labor.....21
Flood control.....3
Highways.....23
Information.....28
Legal aid.....13
Legislative program....12
Life insurance.....26
Livestock.....20
Milk.....14
Packers and stockyards.20
Personnel.....8,9,16,26
Public works.....24
Recreation.....18
Research.....27,28
Rivers and harbors.....3
Roads.....11
Station transfers.....9
Sugar.....1
Travel.....5
Veterans' affairs.....17
Water pollution.....2
Watersheds.....4

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on water pollution bill. House committee reported sugar bill.

HOUSE

1. SUGAR. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11135, to amend the Sugar Act (H. Rept. 1046). p. 23759

2. WATER POLLUTION. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. 4, the proposed Water Quality Act of 1965, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize establishment of water-quality standards, etc. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 23670-1, 23694-700

3. RIVERS-HARBORS; FLOOD CONTROL. Began debate on S. 2300, the rivers-and-harbors and flood-control bill. pp. 23700-842

4. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau plans for watershed projects as follows: Zeigler Creek, Nebr.; Elko, Nev.; Swan Quarter, N. C.; Frogville Creek, Okla.; Chocolate, Little Chocolate, and Lynn Bayou, Tex.; to Agriculture Committee. Bayou Boeuf, La.; Mauch Chunk Creek, Pa.; Middle Creek, Pa.; and Oil Creek, Pa.; to Public Works Committee. p. 23758

5. TRAVEL. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 98, to continue through 1966 the period for promotion of travel in the U. S. This measure will now be sent to the President. pp. 23689-90

6. ELMER THOMAS. Rep. Johnson, Okla., spoke in memory of Elmer Thomas, late Chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. pp. 23690-1

7. ECONOMICS. Rep. Patman commended the President's economic policies. pp. 23743-4

8. PERSONNEL. Rep. Beckworth commended the Civil Service Commission's plans for assurance that summer employees will be selected on a merit basis and with a broader geographical distribution. pp. 23754-5

9. STATION TRANSFERS. The Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee approved H. R. 10607, amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental U. S. p. D947

10. ELECTRIFICATION. The Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee approved S. 1459, amended, to exempt REA cooperatives from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction. p. D947

11. ROADS. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2084, amended, to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems. p. D947

12. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Daily Digest states that the House will today consider the rivers-harbors bill, the HemisFair bill, and the Dade County Center bill. p. D946

SENATE

13. LEGAL AID. Passed as reported S. 1758, to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies. pp. 23627-36

14. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 9221, which includes a provision authorizing the Defense Department to purchase milk for enlisted personnel which was previously furnished without charge by CCC. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 23674-82

15. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 10323, which includes funds to repay CCC for certain family housing projects financed from foreign currencies. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 23682-86

16. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report to the full committee S. 1769 and H. R. 6165, which give department heads discretion as to whether to appoint women. p. D945

When serious storms occur the amount of storm water coming into those sewer systems is such that the treatment plants cannot handle the full flow and a part of the untreated sewage gets into the streams and creates serious problems of water pollution. Therefore, we will have to find an effective method in dealing with and controlling this problem, and that is the purpose for the authorization of $20 million a year for demonstration grants in this particular field.

The bill also establishes a higher priority within the Department of Commerce for the agency dealing with this problem. Therefore, the Public Health Service has been raised in stature you might say to an agency called the Water Pollution Control Administration which will be under the jurisdiction of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce in order to give it the status required to deal with this increasingly important problem.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a good conference report. It represents an effective stride forward in meeting the needs of our Nation in controlling water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the great majority of the people of our Nation and all of the conservation groups of our Nation are most desirous that the Congress take positive action along these lines in order to deal effectively with this difficult problem.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California as well as the chairman of this committee and the other members of the conference committee for the magnificent job they have done in upholding the House position and in bringing back what in my judgment as a member of the Public Works Committee is one of the best bills we have ever had in this House of Representatives.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], as well as all of the members of the conference committee who brought forth this conference committee report.

It seems to me that the report resolves several difficult problems in a most appropriate and admirable way.

Mr. Speaker, my familiarity with this subject of control of water pollution results in large part from my service during the last session when I served on the so-called Jones committee, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] at which time we investigated the subject of water pollution throughout the entire Nation.

As a result of this experience I came to gain a great respect for the ability and record of progress demonstrated by some of the local and State agencies charged with this responsibility of water pollution control.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the conference committee report and the bill recognize the efficacy of these local and State agencies.

I cannot help but feel that responsibility for reducing and eliminating water pollution is one that will have to be undertaken in the long run by the local and State groups. This new legislation should not be interpreted as shifting responsibility to Washington. Instead, it should be noted that it affords direction and guidance on the part of the Federal Government and challenges the local and State agencies to do the job which they are charged with performing under the present legislation and which they are capable of performing.

We should not have any illusions about what we can do from Washington. We are going to have to recognize that water pollution problems are different wherever we find them, and each one differs from every other problem. While we provide funds, while we provide direction, while we provide a new administration for the purpose of resolving the problem of water pollution, at the same time the local and State governments must continue with their responsibility.

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement. I want to express my appreciation to all the conferees and to the able and respected chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], for his support and for his competence and tolerance which enabled us to come out with a workable bill that I know has his support.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, all those who are deeply concerned at the extent to which pollution of our rivers and streams has denied our people the clean water so essential for our health and well-being must welcome the long-delayed appearance here today of the conference report on the Water Quality Act of 1965.

While I recognize that the compromise bill has given rise to some doubt about the speed and effectiveness with which the essential water quality standards can be agreed on and implemented, I share the conclusion of the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., that the legislation will bolster the antipollution cause and do much long-range good.

Final approval of this bill will place a heavy responsibility on State and Federal officials to get about the business of cleaning up the rivers and streams of the United States, so many of which—because of years of pollution—have become virtually unusable. The loss of this immense supply of water has contributed greatly to the present drought emergency in the Northeast. The recovery of the water—through enforcement of adequate water standards and more efficient administration of water pollution control statutes, which this bill will make possible—can help assure a successful attack on the long-range threat of drought.

As a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the Daily Journal editorial of September 17, 1965.

A WATER POLLUTION BILL AT LAST

A compromise nearly 5 months overdue has washed away the barriers to new Federal legislation for the control of water pollution. Its significance is heightened by the drought plight of the Northeast although, of course, the benefits will not come quickly.

The bill gives the States until July 1, 1967, to set water quality standards. It will take a long time to clean up streams and rivers rendered unusable in the present emergency by industrial contamination which has been pouring into them for years.

There's a handy example in the open sewer which is the Hudson River. Earlier this year, the harmful effects of industrial pollution were dramatized for New Jersey when 15,000 trout died in cyanide-tainted waters at the State hatchery in Hackettstown.

Regrettably, the bill had to be weakened by concessions in order to get it passed. The Senate measure, adopted January 28, empowered the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set the water quality standards. Under the revision the States are given the opportunity first.

The change will please those who think the Federal Government is taking away too many of the States rights. But if the States would meet their obligations, there would be no reason for Washington to do what's obviously necessary.

Officials right now would not be casting about so anxiously for sources of potable water if greater attention had been paid by the States and their communities to the problem of pollution. In view of this laxity, more might have been accomplished faster by having the HEW Secretary fix the water standards.

Another provision in the compromise version could be used as a stalling tactic by industry. Companies will be allowed to appeal to the courts for exemptions from the standards.

Watered down as it is, though, the legislation will bolster the antipollution cause. It should do much long-range good.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 379, nays 0, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

YEAS—379

Abbitt	Annunzio	Battin
Abernethy	Arends	Beckworth
Adair	Ashbrook	Belcher
Adams	Ashley	Bell
Addabbo	Ashmore	Bennett
Albert	Aspinall	Berry
Anderson, Tenn.	Ayres	Betts
Andrews, Glenn	Baldwin	Bingham
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bandstra	Blatnik
	Baring	Boggs
	Barrett	Boland
	Bates	Bolling

Brademas	Grider	Morris
Bray	Griffin	Morrison
Brooks	Griffiths	Morse
Broomfield	Gross	Mosher
Broyhill, N.C.	Grover	Moss
Buchanan	Gubser	Multer
Burke	Gurney	Murphy, Ill.
Burleson	Hagan, Ga.	Murphy, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Hagen, Calif.	Natcher
Byrnes, Wis.	Haley	Nedzi
Cabell	Hall	Nelsen
Cahill	Halleck	Nix
Callan	Halpern	O'Hara, Mich.
Callaway	Hamilton	O'Konski
Cameron	Hanley	Olsen, Mont.
Carey	Hanna	Olson, Minn.
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	O'Neal, Ga.
Cederberg	Hansen, Iowa	O'Neill, Mass.
Celler	Hardy	Ottinger
Chamberlain	Harsha	Passman
Chelf	Harvey, Ind.	Patman
Clancy	Harvey, Mich.	Patten
Clark	Hathaway	Pelly
Clausen, Don H.	Hawkins	Pepper
Clawson, Del	Hays	Perkins
Cleveland	Hébert	Philbin
Clevenger	Hechler	Pickle
Cohelan	Helstoski	Pike
Collier	Henderson	Pirnie
Conable	Hicks	Poage
Conte	Horton	Poff
Conyers	Howard	Pool
Cooley	Hull	Price
Corbett	Hungate	Pucinski
Corman	Huot	Purcell
Craley	Hutchinson	Quie
Cramer	Ichord	Quillen
Culver	Irwin	Race
Cunningham	Jacobs	Randall
Curtin	Jarman	Redlin
Curtis	Jennings	Reid, Ill.
Dague	Joelson	Reid, N.Y.
Daniels	Johnson, Calif.	Reifel
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Okla.	Reinecke
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Reuss
Dawson	Jonas	Rhodes, Ariz.
de la Garza	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
Delaney	Jones, Mo.	Rivers, S.C.
Dent	Karsten	Rivers, Alaska
Denton	Karth	Roberts
Derwinski	Kastenmeier	Robison
Devine	Kee	Rodino
Dickinson	Keith	Rogers, Colo.
Dingell	Kelly	Rogers, Fla.
Dole	Keogh	Ronan
Donohue	King, Calif.	Roncalio
Dorn	King, N.Y.	Rooney, N.Y.
Dow	King, Utah	Rooney, Pa.
Dowdy	Kirwan	Rosenthal
Downing	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski
Dulski	Kornegay	Roush
Duncan, Oreg.	Krebs	Rumsfeld
Duncan, Tenn.	Kunkel	Ryan
Dwyer	Laird	Satterfield
Dyal	Langen	St Germain
Edmondson	Latta	St. Onge
Edwards, Ala.	Leggett	Saylor
Edwards, Calif.	Lennon	Scheuer
Ellsworth	Lipscomb	Schisler
Erlenborn	Long, Md.	Schmidhauser
Evans, Colo.	Love	Schneebeli
Everett	McCarthy	Schweiker
Evins, Tenn.	McClory	Scott
Fallon	McCulloch	Secrest
Farbstein	McDade	Selden
Fascell	McDowell	Senner
Feighan	McEwen	Shipley
Findley	McFall	Shriver
Fisher	McGrath	Sickles
Flood	McMillan	Sikes
Flynt	McVicker	Skubitz
Fogarty	Macdonald	Slack
Foley	MacGregor	Smith, Calif.
Ford, Gerald R.	Machen	Smith, Iowa
Fountain	Mackay	Smith, N.Y.
Fraser	Mackie	Smith, Va.
Friedel	Mahon	Stafford
Fulton, Pa.	Marsh	Staggers
Fulton, Tenn.	Martin, Nebr.	Stalbaum
Fuqua	Mathias	Stanton
Garmatz	Matsunaga	Steed
Gathings	Matthews	Stubblefield
Gettys	May	Sullivan
Giaimo	Meeds	Sweeney
Gibbons	Michel	Talcott
Gilbert	Mills	Taylor
Gilligan	Minish	Teague, Calif.
Gonzalez	Mink	Tenzer
Goodell	Minshall	Thompson, N.J.
Grabowski	Mize	Thomson, Wis.
Gray	Moeller	Todd
Green, Oreg.	Monagan	Trimble
Green, Pa.	Moore	Tuck
Greigg	Morgan	Tunney
		Tupper
		Tuten
		Udall
		Ullman
		Utt
		Van Deerlin
		Vanik
		Vigorito
		Vivian
		Waggonner
		Walker, Miss.
		Walker, N. Mex.
		Watkins
		Watson
		Watts
		Weltner
		Whalley
		White, Idaho
		White, Tex.
		Whitten
		Widnall
		Williams
		Willis
		Wilson, Bob
		Wilson, Charles H.
		Wolff
		Wright
		Wyatt
		Wydler
		Yates
		Young
		Younger
		Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—53

Anderson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	Roudebush
Andrews, George W.	Gallagher	Roybal
Bolton	Hansen, Wash.	Sisk
Bonner	Harris	Springer
Bow	Herlong	Stephens
Brock	Holifield	Stratton
Brown, Calif.	Holland	Teague, Tex.
Broyhill, Va.	Hosmer	Thomas
Burton, Calif.	Landrum	Thompson, Tex.
Burton, Utah	Lindsay	Toll
Casey	Long, La.	Whitener
Colmer	Madden	Morton
Daddario	Mailliard	Murray
Diggs	Martin, Ala.	O'Brien
Farnsley	Martin, Mass.	O'Hara, Ill.
Farnum	Miller	
Fino	Powell	
Ford, William D.	Resnick	
	Rogers, Tex.	
	Roosevelt	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Miller with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Morton.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Farnum.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Burton of California.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Harris.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Farnsley.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Madden with Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 11135.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

RIVERS, HARBORS, AND FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 588 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 588

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill, and read by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 588 makes in order the consideration of S. 2300 authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of Federal public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for 3 hours of debate. It is an open rule. It waives points of order and it makes in order the substitute amendments recommended by the committee and as contained in the bill.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, it covers construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and flood control.

The last bill, Mr. Speaker, dealing with this subject was enacted in 1962. There is, on the average, an omnibus bill which has been brought up in the past every 2 to 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, this bill covers 144 projects at an estimated cost of $1.97 billion in 41 States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 588.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has explained the rule in accordance with my understanding and I concur in the remarks which he has made in that respect.

In addition thereto, Mr. Speaker, I would like to break the bill down briefly.

Mr. Speaker, title I is the "Northeastern U.S. Water Supply." This title would authorize an overall regional plan for meeting the future supply needs of the megalopolis now developing along the northeastern seaboard. The plan will provide for a system of major reservoirs, aqueducts between river basins, and purification plants.

The title further provides that any works proposed must be specifically authorized by law. The usual procedure for formulation of such plans, include coordination with State, Federal, and interstate agencies which is a prerequisite to such enactment. The plan is to be a combination of Federal and non-Federal works.

Mr. Speaker, title II has to do with flood control projects.

This title seeks to expedite works on smaller water resources development projects. Presently, such projects are generally included in omnibus river and harbor bills and are subject to the same time consuming authorization procedures as are the major projects.

Mr. Speaker, this title's enactment will enable the committee to review such projects and approve them by resolution, action similar to that used by the Department of Agriculture under the Watershed Flood Prevention Act of 1944, and the GSA under the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

Mr. Speaker, projects under title II are found in the report on pages 13 to 146, inclusive. The title covers 88 projects, at a Federal cost estimated at about $1.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, title III is the beach erosion control projects program. A list of the projects contained under this title can be found at pages 151 through 235. There are 56 projects totaling some $348 million.

Mr. Speaker, section 310 of the bill is an interesting section in that it amends the existing authority available to the Corps of Engineers to construct small navigation and beach control projects without specific congressional authorization, by increasing the current Federal cost limitation to $500,000 per project. The total appropriation for one fiscal year is increased to $10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I assume that all Members have received the same letter that I received from the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN]. He objects to three items in this particular bill and I want to mention those as I am sure he will go into detail on them later during the general debate.

Mr. Speaker, one project has to do with the $227 million Dickey-Lincoln School project on the St. John River in Maine.

The second project to which he objects and to which an amendment I understand will be offered to delete, has to do with the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir on the Cheat River in West Virginia.

The third project has to do with the Federal-private development of power in connection with two dams authorized by this bill to be built on the Flint River in Georgia.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt, as I suppose my colleagues are, of a letter from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] who is in opposition to the first project mentioned under Mr. BALDWIN's letter, namely, the Dickey-Lincoln School project located on the St. John River in Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule itself.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2300, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are submitting today is S. 2300 or the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. Although it is identified as a Senate bill, it really is a new piece of legislation drawn up in the Public Works Committee.

The members of our committee have done an outstanding job in bringing this bill to the floor. I wish to publicly acknowledge the experienced skills of the chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOB JONES], and the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JOHN BLATNIK].

After the Senate completed action on its bill, our committee was given many, many amendments to it. Because they were so numerous and complex and so many changes were made in the original version, we struck out all the language of the Senate bill and are now presenting the Public Works Committee bill as one big amendment. We did this with a view to clarity and saving of time.

S. 2300, as amended, is an omnibus bill similar in all aspects with similar legislation which has been passed regularly by many previous Congresses—in intervals of 2 to 4 years. The last major omnibus bill was in 1962.

However, I ask your indulgence of a few minutes to explain that this omnibus bill is by no means a matter of routine, or the usual and expected.

This year we were presented with one crisis after another—largely due to either too much water, or not enough water.

Weeks before this 89th Congress assembled, we were confronted with the unprecedented devastation caused by the Christmastime floods in the Northwestern States.

We were still studying the enormous destruction to this region's economy and its people when the upper Mississippi Basin areas were hit by floods in April and May.

The rampaging floods in the Mississippi had not abated, when he experienced another disaster in the San Antonio area in May. Then in June we were struck with even more floods in Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska. Then, as we are all aware, we have the critical drought conditions in the Eastern States from Maine to the Chesapeake Bay. We have water problems virtually in every area of the Nation.

To repeat, this omnibus bill is not the usual presentation. The challenge to the very future of our country rests in what we do with our natural resources, especially water, but the demands to do something about them extends to flood control, river development, water pollution, navigation and preservation of our open spaces and recreational areas, which are diminishing at too rapid a rate for our expanding population.

Willingness to meet these challenges are embodied in this legislation. There was willingness before, but now, it is of utmost urgency that we do more.

There are, frankly, many items in this report which were questioned by the committee. I insisted that this be done, before we acted favorably on them. This is one reason that the committee spent 5 weeks in consideration of the various proposals.

Also, there are other worthwhile proposals which are not included in this bill. These must have adequate hearings and consideration, and that explains their absence here. This is why we plan an annual omnibus bill in future years. There are, however, 144 projects in this omnibus bill, and I assure the House that every one of them was included only after long consideration and with full appreciation for their necessity in these critical times of natural upheavals, affecting our national life.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Committee this year has been extremely busy. The membership has been acutely

aware of the needs of our country and its people, now and for future years. This omnibus bill is really a blueprint for long-delayed remedies on a national scale. In that light, we present it to the House, with the hope that it will agree.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished, able, and dedicated chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Flood Control, such time as he may desire.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, S. 2300, the rivers and harbors and flood control bill for 1965, is a result of diligent work on the part of all members of the Committee on Public Works.

I should like to add, in addition, that never in my 19 years of service on the committee have I seen such a cooperative spirit, such a display of talents, and such hard work. There was a spirit of cooperative thinking, work, and application for a total effort. No one could have worked better in harmony and more zealously than the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], the ranking minority member. We carefully analyzed and examined all the projects that were presented to the committee as well as the subject matter of the legislative proposals contained in the bill.

This bill includes 144 individual projects, and the total amount which would be authorized is $1,970,228,000. The projects are located in 41 States and cover flood control, navigation, water supply and related matters.

The Senate held extensive hearings on S. 2300 and passed a bill which was referred to the House Committee on Public Works. We held 5 weeks of hearings on various projects and related matters which were before the committee and eligible for consideration in a bill of this kind. The total amount involved in both the House and Senate version is substantially the same.

The bill has three separate titles. Title I is concerned with water supply for the Northeastern United States. Title II is flood control and related functions. Title III is navigation and beach erosion. In title II and III, there, in addition to individual projects which are recommended for authorization, a number of individual sections dealing with items of general or specific policy, and with provisions for authorizing the Corps of Engineers to carry on general investigations on new projects. In title II, flood control, there are 88 flood control and multiple-purpose projects, with a total authorization of $1,622,159,000.

In title III there are 47 navigation projects, and 9 beach erosion control propects, totaling $348 million. As I mentioned before, the total amount of authorization provided for in this bill is $1,970,228,000.

The committee is considering action on the bill decided that the numerous amendments that would be required to S. 2300 indicated the advisability of preparing a new bill and striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof a substitute which appears in the reported bill.

In addition to the individual projects which would be authorized in this bill, the committee has included two specific authorizations which it considers are needed and justified. The first is title I of the bill which gives authority for a comprehensive planning program, followed up by a construction program if authorized by the Congress, to attempt to solve the water supply problem of the Northeastern United States. The committee feels it would be folly for the Nation to disregard the warning which has been evident over the past several years. Many times in the past this country has recognized that with the growing complexity of social problems, it has become difficult for a solution to be achieved by individuals or local governmental units. The transition from the primitive water supply system of wells in local streams has long since been superseded by metropolitan water supplies. We have now reached the point where metropolitan water supplies are themselves no longer able to satisfy the needs of the people in large metropolitan areas without some degree of dependence upon consideration of water supply in adjoining basins.

Title I of the bill, therefore, would recognize this need and would provide for a plan and ultimate construction of reservoirs and distribution works for the northeastern United States, where the need for water supply is most severely felt. I would like to point out that the provisions of title I would also recognize the necessity for cooperating with the States and with the other Federal agencies in the formulation of such plans, and would specifically provide that the provisions of the Water Resources Planning Act—Public Law 89-80—would be completely recognized and would be actually complemented by the provisions of title I.

Mr. Chairman, the other major legislative item in the bill is the provision in section 201 that provides that projects may be approved by the Committees on Public Works of the House and the Senate if the total Federal cost does not exceed $10 million. This proviso is agreed to by all members of the committee and will tend to reduce the enormous burden which now is imposed upon the Congress by requiring individual consideration of a hash of small projects. This is exactly the same principle and the same proviso that was included in the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and in the Small Watershed Projects Act of the Soil Conservation Service. It streamlines the provisions of the present law for water resource projects in the same way that the program for public buildings and watershed were streamlined many years ago.

Water—the emerging water crisis in the Northeastern portion of our country, the responsibility of the National Government and the development of practical means through cooperation at all levels of government for dealing with this grave problem—these are the themes of title I of S. 2300.

Its genesis is an imperative human need. At stake are the health, welfare, indeed, the very lives of the more than 30 million Americans now living in the vast metropolitan concentration along the Atlantic seaboard from New England to the Nation's Capital.

The Congress of the United States needs no demonstration of the importance of water to human welfare. We are, all of us, keenly aware of the pervasive necessity of water for the normal functions of life. But, only in comparatively recent years, with rising population and particularly the increasing concentration of our people within metropolitan areas, improving standards of living and the growing dependence of industrial technology upon enormous volumes of water, have most Americans begun to realize that water supplies from customary sources are not inexhaustible.

Congress, of course, has long recognized the water problems of the arid portions of our country and for many years has approved and supported Federal action to provide the great irrigation and reclamation works upon which the very existence of modern civilization in the Western States depends. Indeed, the Hoover Dam on the Colorado River constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation is a vital element in the growth of southern California, where the city of Los Angeles and many other communities with a population of some 5 million people are dependent to a major degree upon the Colorado River aqueduct of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California which conveys water from the Colorado Basin to the Pacific coast.

A measure of Federal responsibility for water supply generally was accepted in the Water Supply Act of 1958 with respect to the incorporation of water supply storage in Federal multipurpose reservoirs.

Again in 1961, the Congress, by amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act, authorized inclusion in Federal reservoirs of storage for regulation of streamflow for water quality control as a Federal responsibility.

And in this very session of Congress, the Water Resources Planning Act was enacted with a policy statement to the effect that:

> In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

This developing congressional recognition of the national interest in water supply problems is well founded.

In the highly competent and comprehensive report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission published in 1950, it is stated:

> There is a pressing need for improved cooperation in the planning of river and drainage basin studies which necessarily involve municipal water supplies. * * * The continuing expansion of urban population and industry will require expanding volumes of water. Planning for the development of river systems and drainage basins for the best multipurpose use should, in the broad national interest, take into consideration all problems of industrial and domestic water

supply which directly involve the great majority of the people of the Nation.

Former President Eisenhower commented on the emerging water crisis in these words:

If we are to advance agriculturally and industrially we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil or can be extracted from the oceans.

The late President Kennedy, concerned with the pressure of new demands for water, in a message to Congress stated that:

Our goal, therefore, is to have sufficient water, sufficiently clean, in the right place at the right time to serve the range of human and industrial needs.

President Lyndon B. Johnson—then Vice President—in his dedication of the late, great Senator Robert S. Kerr's book entitled "Land, Wood, and Water," said:

To the Nation collectively, the growing water crisis is just as urgent as it was to me personally when my family was stranded and my property menaced. In fact, I am of the opinion that water management is a decisive tool in our mighty struggle for national security and world peace. The best control and use of this precious resource is the key to progress here and elsewhere. *

A keen sense of the urgency of the problem is reflected in the report of the Select Committee on National Water Resources under the chairmanship of Senator Kerr. There the committee stated:

Human existence depends on water. The pervasiveness of water is revealed dramatically, yet simply, in the initial verses of Genesis' stirring account of the creation. Science tells us that the earliest forms of life began in the vast oceans of the primeval earth. We know that the human body is over 70 percent water. Without water, life as we know it would perish from the earth.

This precious mineral has been a key to man's advancement since before the beginning of recorded history. In addition to personal uses, we need it to grow our crops, to water our stock, to move our heavy cargoes, to dispose of our wastes. Many manufacturing processes depend on water. It is the universal solvent, the universal coolant. We use it to power our industry. And when our work is done, we find water is essential to much of our recreational activity.

The earliest civilizations were established where water supplies were available. Recorded history began in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, and the Nile. Many historians believe that the decline and disappearance from the face of the earth of ancient civilizations in many of the arid or semiarid regions began with the failure to properly use their available water resources. And today, water is assuming ever-increasing importance, as civilization's needs for water and water related products and services grow. Areas of this globe that will thrive, or even survive, will be determined by the availability of water resources and their wise use to serve man.

With its abundant supply of good water, and its advanced technology and skills, the United States need never suffer for lack of water. Water shortages can be alleviated. The lack of water need not limit our economic destiny. But positive action must be substituted for complacency. There is work to be done, work to develop and use the abundant resources placed in our custody by a munificent providence, work to develop the practices and techniques which will permit ever-increasing needs to be filled within the finite limits of the resources we have.

And it was Senator Kerr, with the foresight of deep knowledge, who pinpointed the grave problem with which we seek to deal in title I of the pending bill. In his brilliant book, "Land, Wood and Water," he underscored the growing danger to our national welfare in these words:

Some 40 million Americans today are teetering on the edge of a serious water shortage. * * * This is true all the way from Long Beach, Calif., to Baltimore, Md. New Yorkers were urged to limit drastically their use of water in a recent dry year, before works to bring in their new supply from the Delaware River could be completed."

This is an emergency looking in our windows. Our growing civilization can be rudely jolted, if not checked, by lack of water in the taps. It can be as threatening to survival as the missiles which tower on the launching pads. We can learn from the lessons of Oklahoma City and Washington and New York and wherever shortages have imperiled the lives of our cities. We can bequeath our children cities of iron and stone and aluminum, but we had better be sure we give them the water to make them liveable.

This wisdom has guided your committee in its search for a fruitful approach to what may well be the most critical domestic problem of our time.

We have sought a plan of action which can be initiated now, for there is no time to lose. It is later than most of us can yet imagine until the specter of drought directly touches our own lives. The Corps of Engineers is a force in being with the know-how, the skills and the experience to proceed at once to develop a plan of action. In countless disasters we have called upon the corps. It has never been found wanting in dedication and competence. It will not fail us now.

We have sought a program also which will bring to bear the wisdom and concern of all affected groups, agencies of government—National, State, and local, as well as private interests. Under the proposed legislation, as explained in the committee's report there will be no conflict with existing law and policy in the matter of river basin planning under the Water Resources Planning Act, for the committee seeks coordination of plans developed under that act in the light of the transcendent problem of the entire Northeastern region. Nor will there be any impairment of the existing interstate compacts or other governmental or private interests. For, applicable statutes and directives will assure consultation and cooperation, prior to authorization of recommended works in accordance with law.

Finally, the committee has sought an approach sufficiently comprehensive to deal fully with all ramifications and aspects of the problem. National intiative and a framework for requisite national action are imperative. Just as in the case of flood control, the problem transcends local and State authority and range. Water supplies for the rising concentrations of populations along the eastern seaboard are alread dependent upon multi-State sources. A unified system of supply must eventually be found for the entire complex of related urban and suburban communities. The Federal responsibility cannot be ignored without endangering the health and welfare of millions.

We, therefore, offer the Congress, not a solution, for that is the goal we seek, but an approach with the potential for a solution, comprehensive in scope, sensitive to the variety and complexity of the interests involved and capable of activation soon enough to forestall a national disaster. If we fail to act now—wisely and effectively—we shall be answerable for the suffering of millions of our fellow citizens and for a major impairment to the future welfare of our country. We must not fail.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I might say that it was a privilege until this year to serve with the gentleman who is now in the well, on the great Committee on Public Works in the House of Representatives. I miss my work on that committee and I have missed working with the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I should like to say that during the gentleman's tenure on the committee he was the most effective and attentive member that we had. We have a pleasant memory of his service on the committee.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much. I should like to congratulate him and also my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], on the interest and concern that they have both shown in the problems of the Northeast with respect to water.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the gentleman that the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], who is coauthor of title I, and I do not live in the areas affected, but we did recognize that a national problem there did exist, and therefore we should address ourselves to it promptly. That is what we have earnestly sought to accomplish.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, like most of my colleagues from New York, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, under date of September 14 this year I received from the Delaware River Basin Commission a copy of a resolution stating that title I, to which the gentleman has been addressing himself, would, in the words of the resolution:

Cause a major redistribution of governmental responsibilities within the Federal Government and as between the Federal Government and the States, regional agencies, and local governments.

Will the gentleman comment on that particular point?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will turn to page 11 of the report, commenting on title I of the bill he will find the language specifically setting forth that we were not to trespass upon the authority or the sovereignty or the capabilities of the Delaware Commission. We stated specifically that we were giving them an-

other tool, because they are the ones to implement this program in the area. We thought we were enhancing their role in water resource development, not diminishing it.

Mr. ROBISON. The gentleman refers to page 11, in which it is stated:

> The committee wishes to emphasize that the legislation envisioned in title I will result in no impairment of existing interstate compacts, such as the Delaware River compact, the New England compact, and others.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that section 203 of the bill requires the same reporting system that is contained in the Flood Control Act, section 8, of 1944, so the Corps of Engineers could not transmit to the Congress a report involving the territory or jurisdiction of the Delaware Commission without its comment, as is presently done under existing law.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield one moment further, is not the point here perhaps that the Delaware River Basin Commission has misunderstood this legislation?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would presume so.

Mr. BALDWIN. Precisely this—that there would be no change under title I of the existing congressional procedures requiring first authorization of any project that might be fitted into such plan as the gentleman envisions; and, second, an appropriation by the Congress of the necessary funds to go forward with that project?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We have the same authorization scheme that we have used historically and are doing again with the provisions of titles I and II of the bill.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, where it is stated in title I, section 10, that the plan shall provide for the construction, operation, and so forth of these projected facilities, that language means, in effect, shall only be done according to the carrying out of the traditional congressional procedures for any such facilities or project?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would direct the gentleman's attention to the language which appears on page 46 of the bill. Does the gentleman from Alabama have a copy before him?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No, I do not have a copy at the moment. If the gentleman will withhold his questions, there are 144 projects involved, and I do not have them all in front of me. Let me discuss the matter with the gentleman and I shall go into it further with him later.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That would suit me better. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I believe this bill is a demonstration of the effective, and I believe extremely effective action that can result from our committee seeking and getting a consensus on most of the matters pending before us, particularly when we are given the liberty to do so.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion we were not permitted to work our will in relation to the bill which we voted out of the committee today, the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 bill.

Mr. Chairman, we were given an opportunity to consider this rivers and harbors and flood control matter on its merits. I believe this bill is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, the points of differences of opinion are pointed out largely or clarified largely in the supplemental views of the minority Members.

Those views indicate a difference of opinion relating specifically to certain projects in the flood control section of the bill, and I refer principally to certain projects involving a basic issue which we traditionally have on this bill. This is the question of public power versus private power in those instances when it appears to the committee or at least the members of the committee who are in favor of not using public funds for public power development that private enterprise can do the job and can do it reasonably and can provide power at a more reasonable cost and thus not burden the Federal taxpayers with that additional cost of public power, than can public power at taxpayers expense.

That question, Mr. Chairman, is involved in the projects which will be discussed in detail by the ranking minority member on the Flood Control Subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], and involved with projects that are discussed in the supplemental views in the House report itself on S. 2300 and which involve the Dickey-Lincoln project, on the Saint John River in Maine, the Rowlesberg Dam and Reservoir on the Cheat River in West Virginia, and the Flint River Basin in Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, those are the principal matters in controversy, and I assume that they will be discussed in the debate and also at the time for amendments. I understand amendments will be offered in an effort to bring those projects basically into consistency with the Bureau of the Budget recommendations in some instances and with our views relating to private power versus public power in other instances. The gentleman from California will discuss them in greater detail.

Let me say, given an opportunity to work our will with a free hand, the committee has come up with a bill that, except for those three projects, deserves the support of the Members of the House. As a matter of fact, I think it is one of the most significant authorization bills relating to basic law concerning public works, rivers and harbors, and flood control, that has been brought before this House in my memory. This is for a number of reasons. The reason the gentleman from Alabama just mentioned, relating to title I, is one reason. The Northeastern United States water supply provision provides for a plan to be developed by the Corps of Engineers relating to making available in the future, pursuant to this plan, an adequate water supply and adequate reservoirs. I must say it offers new areas of possibility, and I say possible Federal participation, and that is the transmission lines and purification programs envisioned in the plan.

Again, I specifically point out a proposition that this is a plan and study. I understand the gentleman from Alabama is considering some amendments, one of which would have the effect of clarifying the point asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON]. It is a question I raised in the committee. I offered an amendment, as a matter of fact, that would have required consultation with State authorities, including the local authorities and private enterprise, relating to water resources studies, planning, and programing.

The gentleman from Alabama stated that this was the intention and, therefore, it would be written into the report that that is the case, and it so appears in the language the gentleman read on page 11 of the report, and I quote:

> The usual procedure for formulation of such plans including coordination with State, Federal, and interstate agencies is a prerequisite to such enactment. The same procedures as contained in the present laws shall be applicable to such projects. It should be emphasized that the plan would be a combination of Federal and non-Federal works taking into account those features which may best be constructed or operated and maintained by non-Federal interests.

The gentleman confirms that is a correct statement of his position, particularly in view of his comment on section 203 which sets up the procedures.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do agree with the gentleman because the report, as the gentleman has pointed out, states that specifically.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is also considering offering an amendment that will carry out what is stated in the committee report, and that is to the effect that these plans shall be in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act and consistent therewith. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. At the appropriate time I will offer this amendment:

> On page 37, strike out the sentence which begins on line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (P.L. 89–80) to meet the long-range water needs of the Northeastern United States."

Mr. CRAMER. That act specifically provides for the question raised by the gentleman from New York, a question I also raised requiring State, local, and private enterprise interests involved in this function of providing water resources. I am the first to admit that has become one of the most serious problems in America and, in particular,

in the Northeast. That act specifically says in section 2:

In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprise with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprise, and others concerned.

Now the gentleman is incorporating by reference that language into this legislation; is he not?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the sole intention of the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. So there should be no question about State, local, and private enterprise participation not only with the Water Resources Planning Council but also the Corps of Engineers consideration of recommendations of the Planning Council. Is it my understanding also under the act as it presently exists, the Water Resources Planning Act, that under that the Planning Council does not have the authority to actually come up with plans itself relating to water resources development and therefore this title is needed in order to give the Corps of Engineers proper authority and the power to so evolve a plan?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is my understanding of the act which the gentleman has reference to.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. Of course, whatever plan is being considered has to first be submitted to the Congress for proper authorization at the time the plan is promulgated and proposed. Then, second, for a proper appropriation of funds following congressional action relating to the authorization. So we do get another look, not once but twice, at whatever plan is proposed.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I compliment the gentleman from Florida for the statement he has made, and in particular, on his colloquy with the chairman because, as the chairman knows, he and I toured the country this last year together. While we are now referring to a matter that affects the Northeast, the same thing can be said for the Northwest part of the United States and the areas that we toured out in California, Oregon, and Washington. I think we are setting the stage properly here today with this language which is to be included as mentioned by the chairman. We are in the stages of developing a similar plan for development in my congressional district of California. The Corps of Engineers has developed a preliminary plan of development and presented it to the committee early in the year. Further recommendations will be brought to the committee and the Congress in the coming years as we work cooperatively with the State of California for the maximum development of our water resources.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Recently the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Holum, came before our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works and asked for funds to be included in the pending supplemental bill which will reach us here eventually for the staffing of the water resources council, so called. I asked him at that time if he had any position that he could give to us and particularly to me with respect to title I as contained in the bill before us. He said he did not. I asked him whether or not he envisioned or the Interior Department, since the chairman of that department is chairman of the water resources council—if the Secretary envisioned that the water resources council would be a studying agency with authority to make plans of this type by itself. The answer was—no, it was a coordinating body only. And this is, I think, what the gentleman is attempting to bring out.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I am glad that the RECORD was clarified before his subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee as well, and that the agency is apparently going to follow the intention of the Congress relating to that.

Mr. ROBISON. To continue further, if there were to be studies of this sort, they should and would be done by the various existing agencies or departments having competence in this field so I assume that in this instance it would be the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CRAMER. I trust that this helps to clarify the question of title I relating to the Northeast water study.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important authorization bills that we have considered in some time, not because of the dollar value of approximately $2 billion and, incidentally, that is about what the previous authorization bill was and it has been 3 years since we considered one and this is in effect resulting from a 3-year backlog of projects, and usually we only consider 2-year backlogs so the $2 billion figure is not, in my opinion, an unreasonable one in that respect.

Now what else did the committee do which was of considerable consequence? One thing it did was to promote a new procedure which the gentleman from Alabama explained relating to the authorization of projects, the cost of which does not exceed $10 million. That is the estimated Federal first-cost share does not exceed $10 million. That is the procedure similarly consistent with the Public Buildings Authorization Act of 1959.

That act permits authorization by committees, committees of the House and Senate, instead of authorization by the House and the Senate, or the Congress of public buildings.

The purpose of that provisions is obviously to expedite consideration of these projects. I believe there is every justifications for expedition, for the simple reason that the cost of these projects and the estimated benefits of these projects, as well, often change considerably between the date that they are studied and the date that they are up before our committee for authorization and actual congressional authorization. In many instances that lag time is most unreasonable. The purpose of the provision is to get these projects before them when the figures we have are reliable and obviously when the projects are needed.

Therefore, because of that principle, and knowing the problems that have been involved, in particular relation to this bill, it having been 3 years before we had an omnibus bill, I support the concept of $10 million—no more than that—for estimated Federal share on rivers and harbors, flood control, and beach erosion projects, to be subject to committee authorization.

However, it is my personal view that possibly the rivers and harbors, and beach erosion projects should be a lesser amount, because that involves about 85 percent of the projects in this bill, as an example.

However, we have crossed that bridge. The $10 million figure offers one problem. I should like to discuss it briefly. I may have an amendment relating to it. The figure involved in the $10 million top figure relates to the "estimated Federal share." Many times when we get to the appropriation stage, the amount estimated by the Corps of Engineers increases substantially. Ir there is one thing I want to be sure is avoided by this $10 million authorization section, so far as this Member is concerned, It is to see that this is not used as a subterfuge and not made a sham out of by the proponents of the projects, or the Corps of Engineers, or the Bureau of the Budget, using the $10 million figure, their objective being to keep under it even though they know full well that that figure would not be substantiated at a later appropriation date, when a new estimate would have to be justified.

It should be perfectly clear in the record that the $10 million figure which is authorized is an estimated Federal share, and that can be increased substantially at the time of the appropriation without additional authorization by our committee.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if that is not a correct statement. The amount authorized in this bill, and all others, is the "estimated Federal share" of the cost of the projects as it relates to the $10 million committee authorization section in the bill; is that not correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it not correct that at the time of the appropriation the figure can be exceeded without our committee acting further on the authorization?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It may not exceed the $10 million authorization.

Mr. CRAMER. I am quoting the language in section 201, a committee authorization similar to that for public buildings, which section is for projects estimated to cost not more than $10 million, which reads as follows: "if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10 million"—that is the estimated

Federal first cost. Before the Appropriations Committee, that figure could be exceeded if the estimate at that time should exceed the estimate before our committee.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No; the appropriation could not exceed $10 million. For example, if the Appropriations Committee were considering a project, the authorization for which might be $5 million, that committee could not make an expenditure of $6 million. The same rule applies here.

Mr. CRAMER. I will ask the gentleman an additional question, using the example of the Housatonic River Basin on page 41 of the bill. There is proposed the authorizing of the project "at an estimated cost of $5,100,000."

If the estimate of the cost of that project at the time of appropriation is $6 million, in the opinion of the gentleman would the Appropriations Committee exceed its authority, if it authorized the expenditure of funds in excess of $5.1 million?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I believe it would.

Mr. CRAMER. I hope that is true, but I understand that is not the procedure followed, and that in many instances the Appropriations Committee exceeds the amount and does so because the language is "the estimated cost."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If the estimated cost is submitted to the Public Works Committee at $5.1 million and is so approved, no appropriation should be made in excess of that amount.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it the intention of the gentleman—because it is the intention of this gentleman, as well—that the $10 million top figure shall be the limitation not only for authorization before our committee but also for appropriations before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is stating correctly what section 201 intends to accomplish. There can not be an appropriation in excess of the authorized amount.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

I would hope, with this legislative record, that the top limitation will be observed. I should be very concerned if by authorizing an estimated amount appropriations could be provided for a project substantially in excess of that amount. I hope this legislative record will clarify that.

There is one other point relating to new authorizations generally under this bill which I want to discuss. It takes another giant step—and I believe a giant step forward—by providing that the small project authorization amounts and the lump sum appropriations shall be increased. The total appropriation is to be increased to some $10 million for all of these small projects, and the size of the projects is to be increased from $200,000 per project, for Federal costs, for rivers and harbors, to $500,000, and from $400,000 for beach erosion to $500,000. That brings those into uniformity. Flood control remains at the present amount of $1 million which does not require authorization by Congress and under this new procedure authorization by the committees, or even the submission to Congress of a resolution authorizing a survey of the project.

These are the small projects on which the Corps of Engineers can act to authorize them. The Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee will have submissions made to them regarding the project, but our committee does not need to take action thereon.

I believe that is a sound approach. The proposal in the subcommittee was to make it $1 million for all such projects. The full committee, I believe properly so, made it half a million dollars for beach erosion and rivers and harbors, and $1 million for flood control, as it presently is. I support that action.

There were two other matters on which the committee took action. I wish to call those briefly to the attention of the House.

First, this bill authorizes a codification of all water resources laws, which will permit those who are interested, the general public and the local authorities, to know exactly what is the basic law relating to all of these projects now and in the future, as was done with respect to the highway recodification. I believe that is a sound approach, and I am confident the Engineers will carry it out in the very near future.

There is another section which was written into the bill, which contains language I shall comment on, relating to those communities which wish to go forward with a project and be reimbursed for the expenditure when the construction is consistent with whatever plan has been authorized by Congress. Many such examples have been called to our attention. As a matter of fact, there are some in this bill where we specifically as a committee—and hopefully, the Congress—authorize repayment to those local communities when the work done is consistent with the plans authorized by the Congress.

It is my belief that we should not pick and choose in these projects, we should not say "yes; it is all right" to one and not to another, without having some sort of standard apply to all of them. For that reason, I proposed, and there is now in this bill, a provision that a restudy be made relating to what our policy should be concerning reimbursement of moneys expended by the local interests on projects when the work done is consistent with the authorized project, permitting possible Federal repayment to that community or local agency sometime in the future.

I hope it will result in some standard or nationwide policy relating to this matter, which can be considered at the proper time in the next authorization bill. I think this is a good and sound approach to this problem which to date we are dealing with on a project-by-project, piecemeal basis, with no real standards being involved.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

(Mr. LANDRUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman. I request this time so as to address some questions to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland, with regard to a project in Georgia known as Trotter's Shoals. In years past it has not been authorized by the committee on the grounds that it did not have approval of the Bureau of the Budget. I want to ask the chairman at this point if it is true that this project is now before his committee as pending business. Is that true, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FALLON. May I say to the gentleman that no consideration was given to Trotter's Shoals as a project this year because at the time we were considering the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill we did not have the proper reports on Trotter's Shoals, but I understand that we do have the reports and it will be pending business before the Committee on Public Works when an omnibus bill is considered next year.

Mr. LANDRUM. Is it the intention of the chairman that his committee will meet next year, in 1966, to consider an omnibus rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. FALLON. That is the desire of the committee at the present time.

Mr. LANDRUM. And at that time the Trotter's Shoals project will be pending business before the committee?

Mr. FALLON. It is pending business and will be given consideration.

Mr. LANDRUM. The record discloses that the project labeled as Trotter's Shoals now has the approval of the Departments of Commerce, Defense, HEW, Agriculture, Interior as well as the Bureau of the Budget. Is that correct?

Mr. FALLON. As I understand it, that is correct.

Mr. LANDRUM. So there will be no necessity when the committee reconvenes January next to again ask these departments to make reports?

Mr. FALLON. No, it will not be necessary to get a second report. It will be pending business.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300. During the 5 weeks of intensive hearings that our Subcommittee on Flood Control held on the flood control aspects of the bill, it has been my privilege to work very closely with the chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. No person in this House worked with more diligence, more conscientiousness, and more sincerity on this flood control section of the bill than did the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. It was a privilege on my part to work with him on this bill.

This bill is a many-faceted bill. It affects practically every part of the coun-

try. In the northern California region the bill contains authorization for a very important deep water channel project from San Francisco Bay to Stockton. This is a project which has been made necessary by the trend toward deeper draft shipping which has occurred since World War II. This trend has had an impact on deep water ports throughout the Nation.

Since World War II, particularly with tankers and bulk cargo carriers, there have been bigger and bigger ships built with deeper draft, and the old channel depths that at one time could accommodate all types of ships no longer can accommodate the new type vessels. For this reason it is important to the northern California region that there is included in this bill the project authorizing a deep water channel from San Francisco Bay to Stockton to handle the deeper draft ships now coming into San Francisco Bay and serving the ports on the tributaries to that bay.

Also, in this bill is another survey important to that area; that is the authorization of a study by the Corps of Engineers of the feasibility of constructing an interceptor drain to go around San Francsico Bay and out to the ocean to handle the disposal of sewage effluent and industrial wastes, including agricultural waste waters so that these might be disposed of in the ocean and not involve further pollution to San Francisco Bay. This is a study to determine whether construction of such an interceptor drain might be feasible. The recommendations of the Corps of Engineers will have to come back to Congress and be considered by this body.

There are in this bill several projects involving public power on a major scale, and on these projects there was a sincere difference of opinion within our committee. And there has been for many years a sincere difference of opinion among the Members of the House as a whole on this issue. In most cases, the House has given recognition to the fact that in connection with multiple-purpose projects it may be necessary to authorize public power as a part of those projects. But where projects are of such a nature that the power aspects can be differentiated from the rest of the project there have been differences of opinion as to how these should be handled.

In this bill this issue has come to a focal point in three projects; the St. John's project in Maine, the Cheat River project involving Rowlesburg Dam in West Virginia and the Flint River project in Georgia.

The St. John's project in Maine basically is a single-purpose project for all practical purposes because it involves more than 95 percent power, and therefore it is basically a power project. The flood control aspects in it are minute.

In connection with the Rowlesburg Dam on the Cheat River in West Virginia and also the Flint River project, these are multiple-purpose projects that could be justified from an economic standpoint without the public power features being constructed by the Federal Government. In each of these three cases there was testimony before the committee by representatives of private enterprise, in the form of the investor-owned public utility companies in the areas involved that they had been providing the power needs of the area and felt that they could continue to do so in the future.

Those of us who are concerned about the size of the Federal budget today, those of us who are concerned about the size of the Federal deficit today do not feel that Federal funds should be expended where testimony has been given before our committee that the power needs of an area can adequately be supplied by private enterprise in the form of investor-owned public utility companies. For this reason there will be amendments offered on the floor to eliminate the St. John's project and to modify the Cheat River project in West Virginia and the Flint River project in Georgia. In the case of the Cheat River project, the amendment will authorize the project except for the public power aspects of the project; and in the case of the Flint River project the amendment will authorize a partnership development of the project so that private enterprise can develop the power facilities in connection with the project.

I might say in connection with the Cheat River project in West Virginia that an application has been pending before the Federal Power Commission on the part of an investor-owned public utility for a permit to build a power facility on that river. Just a few weeks ago—since our hearings in fact—the Federal Power Commission has granted a preliminary permit to that private company to make a study to determine the feasibility of going forward with such power facilities on their own.

I do not believe we should be authorizing a public power project in connection with that dam when this private application is pending and a study has been authorized by the Federal Power Commission to determine the feasibility of constructing private power facilities to provide the power needs of that area.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments will be offered during the amendment period. We hope the House will consider these amendments on their merits, giving consideration to the need for our saving the expenditure of Federal funds wherever such savings are possible.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

(Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] about a bill which I introduced, H.R. 8298, and which I had hoped would become a part of this omnibus bill.

Mr. Chairman, that bill would have authorized the Secretary of the Department of the Army to grant rights of storage and transportation on the Dworshak Reservoir in Idaho.

My question is with reference to the disposition of the committee toward the bill and whether it was judged necessary for the activities planned on that reservoir.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentlemen from Idaho that the Flood Control Subcommittee examined the proposition which the gentleman has reference to, most thoroughly.

As the gentleman knows, the Department of the Army reported that it now is in possession of sufficient statutory authority to do under existing law what the gentleman from Idaho proposes to do in his resolution.

If the gentleman will refer to the 1962 Flood Control Act, sections 2667 and 2668 of title 10, United States Code, the gentleman will find that this confers ample power upon the Secretary to do everything he could do under H.R. 8298, if it were adopted.

There was no necessity for the committee to report out that bill, since there is ample statutory authority to accomplish the aims of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama and to congratulate him on the bill which he has brought before the Congress today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

(Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of the project to provide flood protection on Chartiers Creek Basin in Pennsylvania, which is to be found at page 57 of the bill, and which is located in the Ohio River Basin, and to be found at page 37 of the report.

[Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

(Mr. CLARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, what I nave to say on the bill presently being considered will relate entirely to only one project—the Dickey-Lincoln School propect in northern Maine. I do not intend to engage in a philosophical discussion concerning private versus public power; rather, I want only to talk some economic sense. That there are serious questions concerning the economic feasibility of this project is clearly indicated by the fact that these questions concerning it are coming from both sides of the aisle—so what we have to discuss is bipartisan in nature.

The Dickey-Lincoln School authorization will, in due course of time, amount to something well in excess of $300 million. The present authorization is for $227 million—which, by the way, constitutes almost 10 percent of the entire bill. However, if it is authorized, and in time built with an additional $80 million

for transmission lines, the total cost will be about $300 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, $300 million is a considerable sum of money for the Members to consider. If the proposed project had clear benefits to the Nation; if the Federal agencies involved were in agreement; if it were going to pay itself off in due course of time; and if it benefited the New England area without damaging other parts of the Nation, then we might be able to proceed with confidence. But it does none of these things—and it seems to me that a bill with five strikes against it has to be considered a bad bill—any way you look at it.

Let us take up these five points briefly, examine them carefully, and then see if our colleagues can still, in good conscience, approve such a massive authorization.

First, the question must be raised as to whether there would be a clear benefit to the Nation. I think to be fair one must agree the expenditure of well over 200 million Federal dollars in Maine would bring benefits to that State. Even if only temporary—and it would be temporary—a depressed region would be helped. The question then immediately comes to mind as to whether there might not be a better way to assist this State, and it would appear—once looking at this project—there must be a number of ways which are better. On the other hand, extensive testimony during our committee's hearings indicated that in order for this project to succeed—to be economically feasible—it had to be considered on a New England-wide basis.

There is also considerable evidence that although the theoretical purpose of the project is to help reduce the high power costs of this region, it will not even do that. Therefore, if this power project is a temporary pumping of Federal dollars into the Maine economic bloodstream and there are better ways to accomplish such a goal, then I submit it cannot be classified as a project having national benefits. I have every desire to assist the people of Maine with their economic problems; I am simply saying we should, and can, do that within the context of national benefit.

The second important question which must be discussed if we are to bring any sort of reason to this proposal relates to the disagreement of Federal agencies over the desirability of proceeding at this time with the Dickey-Lincoln School portion of the Passamaquoddy project. A careful reading of the report of the Secretary of the Interior to the President, dated July 9 of this year, indicated basic disagreements between several agencies concerning the project. For this reason, I suggested in my supplemental views to the Public Works Committee report on S. 2300 that the interested Federal agencies have not given the Congress sufficient information upon which to make an enlightened decision. The Interior Department gives us a set of numbers concerning costs on the project. But these numbers are directly challenged by the electric companies of the area who should be in a pretty good position to know the cost situation in their own area. In addition, two comprehensive engineering studies, done by consulting engineering firms, challenged the cost figures of Interior. The Commerce Department, in their report, expressed reservations concerning the project. The Treasury Department questioned the interest rates used in charting the costs of the job.

Now, in the midst of all of this confusion, we are being asked to proceed with an authorization of immense size without further information. The electric companies of the area, rather than simply opposing this project have offered concrete, well-thought-out, and feasible economic alternatives that would not require the expenditure of a dime of the public's money. Therefore, I submit that this hardly qualifies as a project with which we can proceed with confidence.

Meeting the standards of feasibility previously established by the Congress brings us into still another gray area. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all know it is a requirement that other alternatives be carefully examined before requests for authorization are made. Yet here we find, from the testimony at the hearings, that the Interior Department quickly skimmed over available alternatives—that is, the generation of electric power by large thermal plants—both conventional and nuclear, tied to pumped-storage electric plants. Several Federal agencies questioned the lack of sufficient exploration of these alternatives, and I question them as well. Additionally, it was admitted by the Secretary of the Interior at the hearings that no studies, or even conversations, had been held with the private companies of this area concerning the marketing of the power to be produced. And yet more than 90 percent of this power will have to be sold to these companies for the project even to come close to being feasible. The electric companies have indicated serious reservations about the ultimate purchase of the output of this project, because they say the power will cost too much; will, in fact, cost more than they are producing power for at some of their plants right now, and most certainly will cost more than the average to be produced in New England by 1972 when this project would go on the line. No consideration of nuclear-conventional thermal plants tied to pumped storage, no consideration of marketing plans; this hardly meets the standards of the Congress, requiring thorough examination of feasible alternatives.

Perhaps an even more fundamental issue, Mr. Chairman, is whether the Congress is being asked here for a subsidy rather than an investment that will pay off over a period of years. In an unusual move, the Interior Department is taking a 100-year period of amortization and benefit, when, by their own previous standards, 50 years is used. Why does this project have a 100-year life? I still do not have the answer to that question. If anything, it should probably have a 25-year life in view of the fact that, in the New England area, anyway, the rapid development of nuclear power and large-scale conventional thermal efficiencies are making waterpower peaking stations increasingly obsolete. Some engineers question whether any such plant can now be considered modern and efficient when measured against the fact that the small Yankee atomic electric plant in this area, built at a cost of only $40 million, is turning out power—and more of it—than this massive project will be able to do a half decade or more from now. How can we be reasonably expected to believe that Dickey-Lincoln School will be an efficient, low-cost power source in the year 2070? A questionable payoff in economic terms indeed.

Finally, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that even considering all the foregoing, if the project benefited all the New England States—which it does not or it hardly seems likely there would be Members of the House from that area opposing it—you could make some kind of a case for it, provided it did no harm to other areas of the Nation. But it does. It would mean, for example, that this large hydroelectric plant would be built—slowing down the development of the nuclear industry in the New England region, reducing the sale of coal and oil to the region and benefiting no one at all since it would not reduce the cost of power to the consumers of the region.

Mr. Chairman, frankly I get a little lost in the maze of some kind of new political-economic logic that asks us earlier in the session to appropriate moneys to assist economically deprived Appalachia and its coal industry—and then later in the session asks us to authorize even more Federal moneys so that we can reduce this business more in Appalachia by building a project which will do nothing for the people of New England.

It seems to me to be like something out of "Alice in Wonderland." And it reminds me of the saying therein, "Will you walk a little faster, said the whiting to the snail, there's a porpoise close behind us and he's treading on my tail." This project is a porpoise treading on everyone's tail—costing everyone, benefiting no one. I suggest Mr. Chairman, that we had best walk a little slower on this one. I suggest it be returned for considerably further study until such time as the Federal agencies involved can give us a clear picture of what we are doing with our consituents' money.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, Congressman TUPPER and I have written Members of the House concerning the desirability of House approval of the so-called Dickey-Lincoln School projects in northern Maine. The full text follows:

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are writing to you to urge your support for the Dickey-Lincoln School flood control and hydroelectric project on the Upper St. John River in Maine as authorized under S. 2300, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. This project which was strongly endorsed by President Johnson in a letter of transmittal to both the House and the Senate has passed the Senate and, of course, has been endorsed by the House Public Works Committee. It is our understanding that when this bill comes up for consideration this week an effort will be made to strike this project from the bill. In an effort to gain your support for this project and to correct misunderstandings which may

have arisen we submit the following points for your consideration:

1. The Dickey-Lincoln School project has a benefit cost ratio of 1.86 to 1.

2. History has shown that Federal hydroelectric plants bringing low-cost electricity into an area have stimulated the demand for power from fossil fuel generating plants; i.e., plants using coal, oil, or gas, so that the demand for such fuel is enhanced.

3. In other sections of the country private utilities were violently opposed to hydroelectric projects at first but after they realized the benefits which accrued to them through the increased consumption of electricity brought about by the decrease in rates they began to cooperate with such projects. On the Upper Colorado River Basin in 1962, Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, negotiated a jointly constructed transmission grid with private companies to market public power on that river. Last year Secretary Udall again successfully negotiated a huge project integrating the electric facilities of the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. Six private utilities, the city of Los Angeles, and the Department of Interior are participating in this history-making project and today the largest combine, comprising nearly all of the western utilities, is discussing with the Department of Interior the legitimate role each can play in meeting the future power needs of a 10-State area.

4. The alternate proposal of an atomic plant with pumped storage proposed by the Electric Coordinating Council of New England in its last-minute attempt to thwart the Dickey project does not stand up as indicated by the attached memorandum.

There is no question that nuclear energy holds great promise for the future. We think it should be developed just as we believe our fossil fuel resources should be developed and used. But we do not think we can casually dismiss the flexibility and compatibility of hydroelectric energy which complements rather than competes with thermal generating sources. The fact is that the Dickey-Lincoln School project and its associated transmission system will help stimulate the aforementioned use of fossil fuel and nuclear energy in New England by lowering rates and increasing consumption of electrical energy thus requiring larger thermal generating capacity.

5. The Dickey project has been thoroughly studied since a survey was first authorized by President Eisenhower in 1956.

6. The project was thoroughly reviewed by the Federal Power Commission which gave the project a green light only after making the finding that there was no better alternate.

7. There is no question with respect to the need for this power. Even the opponents to the project admitted this need in hearings before the subcommittee.

8. Although the ratio of power benefits to flood control and other benefits of this project is very high, this is certainly not unprecedented in Congress especially where the need for low-cost power is acute.

9. As a long-standing policy, the Department of Interior does not discuss the marketing of power for any project prior to authorization by Congress. This policy is a sound one because no Member of the House would advocate the Federal Government committing itself to a course of action before the proper committees of the House and the Congress as a whole had approved that course of action.

10. All computations were made in accordance with Senate Document No. 97. Computations for the marketing of the power included load factor, capacity, and energy and repayment within 50 years which included both the cost of the project ($227 million) plus the transmission line ($73 million). All figures were studied and approved by the Federal Power Commission.

11. The project as the support of all appropriate executive agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Interior and the Corps of Engineers.

12. Power costs in New England are the highest of any region in the country; and there is no public power yardstick in any of the six New England States.

13. The Dickey-Lincoln School project would be located in an economically depressed area where, for example, 33 percent of the families have incomes of less than $3,000 per year; 48.6 percent of the population is over 65 or under 15 years of age. This is an area where wholesale rates for electric energy average three times what Dickey-Lincoln School rates, delivered would be.

14. The price of power from the Dickey-Lincoln School project will be less than one-half that of the average charge in New England today.

15. All of the power projects in the bill are good projects in meeting the benefit-cost tests laid down by the Congress. Dickey-Lincoln School compares very favorably with these other projects.

We believe this project to be in the best interests of Maine, New England, and the country and therefor seek your support.

Sincerely,

WM. D. HATHAWAY,
Second District, Maine.
STANLEY R. TUPPER,
First District, Maine.

POWER COMPANY SUBSTITUTE FOR DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT IS MISLEADING, COSTLY, AND NOT CAPABLE OF SERVING THE SAME PURPOSE

(By the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association)

The Electric Coordinating Council of New England (ECCNE), which numbers the principal investor-owned electric utilities in that region among its membership, claims that it has devised a substitute project which purports to be superior to the Dickey-Lincoln School development and to thereby render the latter unnecessary. The proposed substitute plan, which was released scarcely a week before the House hearings, combines a pumped storage peaking plant in western Massachusetts and a nuclear baseload plant on Long Island Sound in Connecticut as an alternative to the all hydro Dickey-Lincoln School development in northeastern Maine. The companies' alternative is assertedly designed to parallel Dickey-Lincoln School, but it fails to do this in a number of important respects.

Dickey and Lincoln School would together develop 794,000 kilowatts of installed capacity. Of this amount, it is estimated that 635,000 kilowatts of capacity would be used for peaking purposes with an annual output of 330 million kilowatt-hours; the remaining 159,000 kilowatts being used to produce an annual 695 million kilowatt-hours of energy at 50 percent load factor. Net annual generation would therefore be 1,025 million kilowatt-hours.

The big block of 635,000-kilowatt peaking capacity would be available to any electric system which operates its own generation. Its cost delivered would be $15 per kilowatt per year as compared to $23.50 per kilowatt/year estimated by FPC to apply to new power company plants scheduled for New England. The 50-percent load factor energy could be sold to co-ops, municipals, and power companies which do not own any generation. It would be firm power for them. It would cost them about 7 mills/kilowatt-hour delivered. They now pay from 13 to 20 mills.

The ECCNE proposal embodies a pumped storage peaking project of 612,000 kilowatts in western Massachusetts and a 159,000-kilowatt portion of a 700,000-kilowatt nuclear plant on Long Island Sound. The combined project would develop approximately the same capacity and annual energy as Dickey-Lincoln School. But the similarity between the two plans ends there.

First of all, very little transmission is associated with the ECCNE proposal; $4 million compared to $73 million in transmission for the Federal Dickey-Lincoln School project. Thus, the ECCNE plan is geographically no substitute because its power could not be delivered to Maine, New Hampshire, or eastern Massachusetts. Moreover, the purported economics of the ECCNE proposal are not supported by present or anticipated experience in the electric industry, as the following points make clear:

1. The $80 per kilowatt cost of ECCNE's pumped storage peaking capacity is lower than anything built in modern times. At chapter 7 (p. 121) of its National Power Survey, entitled "Peaking Power," the FPC states: "Economically attractive projects usually cost $100 to $120 per kilowatt or less." Experience has taught that this estimate, though essentially accurate, may be slightly liberal.

The Taum Sauk project of the Union Electric Co.—the most recently constructed pumped storage project of significance—has 350,000 kilowatts installed and cost $50 million to construct, for a cost of $143 per kilowatt. Projects in Colorado, one under construction and one proposed, anticipate costs of $107 per kilowatt and $137 per kilowatt, respectively.

In the light of the above, a realistic cost for the ECCNE pumped storage project would be $110 per kilowatt, or $8,820,000; 38 percent above the ECCNE estimate.

2. The energy costs for the 311 million kilowatt-hours expected to be generated from the ECCNE pumped storage project also seems low. A widely accepted rule of thumb for pumped storage units requires 3 kilowatt-hours of offpeak steam energy to pump water uphill in order to get 2 kilowatt-hours of peaking energy from the storage reservoir when the water is allowed to run back down through the turbines. Since electric energy, even at wholesale rates, would be bargain priced at 4.62 mills per kilowatt-hour, claimed by ECCNE to be its pumping cost per kilowatt-hour, it seems clear they have only counted on using one unit of energy for pumping in order to get one back. Therefore, the proper energy costs for the pumped storage project would not be 4.62 mills per kilowatt-hour as claimed by ECCNE, but 6.93 mills per kilowatt-hour. As a result, the total energy costs for the project would not be $1,480,000, as claimed, but $2,230,000; 50 percent above the ECCNE estimate.

3. The ECCNE plan assumes a nuclear capacity cost of $114 per kilowatt and fuel cost of 1.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, both of which figures seem extremely low. Also, the choice of a 700,000-kilowatt plant as the source of such capacity which would be available from Dickey-Lincoln School is inherently unfair for a unit cost comparison.

(a) At chapter 5 of the National Power Survey, entitled "Nuclear Power," table 31 indicates that a 500-megawatt plant constructed as late as 1970 would have a cost of from $132 to $152 per kilowatt. Fuel costs for such a project at that time might be 1.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

(b) The Advisory Committee Report No. 15 of the Survey, entitled "Nuclear Development," states in its table 1(A) that the installed cost of a 500,000-kilowatt nuclear unit in 1967 will vary between $160 and $185,

with fuel costs running 1.9 mills per kilowatt-hour.

(c) We respectfully point out that no project approaching the size of 700,000 kilowatts, which the ECCNE proposal envisions, has yet been built in this country. The best known plant approaching that size is the Oyster Creek plant of the Jersey Central Power & Light Co. which would have a nameplate 515,000-kilowatt unit installed at a cost of $68 million, averaging out to a per-kilowatt cost of $132—16 percent above the $114 per kilowatt estimate by ECCNE. Another plant under construction is the Nine Mile Point Plant of the Niagara-Mohawk Power Corp. which would develop 500,000 kilowatts installed at a cost of $90.2 million; this averages out to a cost of $180 per kilowatt, 58 percent above the ECCNE estimate.

In view of the above it is likely that the 159,000-kilowatt plant would cost $180 per kilowatt, while the 700,000-kilowatt plant would cost $130 per kilowatt, both substantially higher than the ECCNE estimate.

4. The ECCNE estimate of associated transmission is only $3,950,000, as against an estimated $73 million for the Dickey-Lincoln School transmission. The ECCNE proposal thus envisions transmission construction being limited to the immediate location of the plants. Citizens of Vermont and of New Hampshire and of Maine would apparently be limited to existing transmission line voltages, most of which, at 115 kilovolts, have only one-ninth the carrying capacity of the proposed 345-kilovolt Federal lines. Thus, the ECCNE proposal, in terms of its location, is not a substitute for the Federal project.

5. There is no assurance whatever that any savings derived by the companies from their proposal would result in lower power bills for the consumers of New England. During the hearings, the ECCNE company witnesses refused flatly and repeatedly to answer questions as to the rate at which power from their proposed substitute would be sold. We know that the Federal power would be cheaper than any existing or potential source in New England—$15 per kilowatt per year plus 3 mills for energy.

In the light of the above facts, without which it cannot be properly understood, the ECCNE proposal is reevaluated and compared with the Dickey-Lincoln School projects in tabular form in the appendix. The table shows quite clearly that the annual cost of the ECCNE proposal would far exceed that of Dickey-Lincoln Schol. The ECCNE projects are also deficient in that they would not provide the average annual $1 million benefits to flood control, area redevelopment, and downstream hydro projects attributable to Dickey-Lincoln School.

In short, Dickey-Lincoln School will provide more benefits at lower cost than the ECCNE alternatives. And, of overriding importance to the people of New England, the benefits of the low-cost power to be developed at the Federal project will flow through to the consumer.

APPENDIX

Economic comparison of Dickey-Lincoln School with ECCNE-proposed "Substitute"

	ECCNE proposal [1]		Dickey-Lincoln School
	With 700-megawatt nuclear plant	With 159-megawatt nuclear plant	
Fixed charges for peaking power (13.1 percent of $110)	$8,820,000	$8,820,000	
Energy costs for peaking power (at 6.93 mills per kilowatt-hour)	2,230,000	2,230,000	
Fixed charges for load factor power ($19.10 per kilowatt for 700-megawatt plant; $26.50 per kilowatt for 159-megawatt plant)	3,040,000	4,210,000	
Energy costs for load factor power (1.8 mills per kilowatt-hour for 700-megawatt plant; 2.2 mills per kilowatt-hour for 159-megawatt plant)	1,250,000	1,530,000	
Annual charges for transmission	600,000	600,000	
Total annual charges	15,940,000	17,390,000	$11,900,000

[1] Figures are those submitted by ECCNE corrected to reflect industry experience and FPC estimates.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to speak in support of the rivers and harbors omnibus bill that is presently before this body. I wish to take this time briefly to compliment the chairman and the ranking members on all the committees. As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has so ably suggested, whenever this committee has an opportunity to work its will, I am convinced that the committee is one of the finest committees in the House.

During this past year we have been hit with disasters and tragedies throughout the Nation. Not only has this committee concerned itself with proposed legislation and recommendations to correct some of these problems in the future, but this particular committee has gone out into these various areas and actually seen firsthand some of the problems. Chairman JONES of Alabama has demonstrated great leadership, compassion, and understanding as he directed many of these visitations. It was my privilege to accompany him on most of these trips. We toured most of the United States wherever disasters took place with these committees. I can say without any reservation that this was one of the greatest morale boosters to the people in the areas affected, at a time when they really needed it the most, that I have ever seen.

This bill would authorize some of the most needed public works projects, and it should have the support of every Member of this body.

Like most of the bills that come before us, there are areas in which we have disagreements. I cannot say I support everything in the bill. But by and large, this is a good bill, and will be of great benefit not only to the Congress but to the entire country.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works and a member of the Subcommittee on Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control, which held more than a month of hearings on the bill, I believe I can testify with some degree of accuracy to the almost incalculable amount of human suffering and property damage that will be saved if these projects are completed.

Last winter my own congressional district suffered from a lack of projects such as these. I fervently hope a failure of foresight and planning will not allow this to happen again.

This past year we have seen the loss of hundreds of lives and many millions of dollars of property damaged by floods throughout our Nation. If we are to prevent similar catastrophes from happening each year, now is the time to authorize these projects so the final planning can begin.

I sincerely believe that we are discussing an area today in which Federal participation is right and proper. These projects represent the best in intergovernmental cooperation. It takes both local interest and Federal Government to bring any project to a successful conclusion. To my mind, that is how it should be.

The reasons why the Federal Government should participate in these projects are many. First, many of the projects are interstate in nature and, as such, properly belong in the sphere of activities of the Federal Government. Second, some of the projects deal with navigable waterways and they, too, are a function of our Federal Government because the Corps of Engineers has jurisdiction over the navigable streams of America.

Finally, many of these projects require financial resources that are beyond the reach of local interests. Certainly the role of the Federal Government is to do that which cannot be done at a lower level of government. Included in this bill there are projects which could not and would not be undertaken if left solely to local interests, as the local interests have neither the financial resources nor the expertise to devote to these large projects.

Quite frankly, I wish that some of the States throughout the Nation would develop programs of public works authorization on their own, with respect to smaller community projects, in cooperation with the cities, counties, and local districts. This would be an example of our federal system of government working at its best.

Before concluding my remarks, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies, for their excellent cooperation in preparing the preliminary plans for the projects in this bill. I personally have had the finest working relationship with these two agencies, and I am delighted to commend them from the House floor today. Certainly, interagency cooperation for multiple purpose project development must be the theme of this Congress as we offer legislation to advance the orderly development of this great Nation. This is our responsibility, and I am convinced our committee has done an excellent job in proposing this omnibus bill to the House for approval.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

(Mrs. DWYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, there are several provisions in the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill now before us which I believe make this an outstanding piece of legislation. At the outset, therefore, I want to express my appreciation for the work of the Public Works Committee and especially its Subcommittees on Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors.

This year, more than most, we have experienced in this country the great destructive power of nature—both in the prolonged drought which has afflicted most of the populous Northeast and in the severe flooding which has devastated areas in the West. We have learned again that conservation, control, and development of our precious water resources in a matter of growing urgency, especially as our people continue to congregate in heavily populated urban areas and place an increasing strain on the capacity of State and local governments to provide these basic water resources. It is the purpose of this bill, therefore, to harness nature, to overcome the extremes of shortage and surfeit, and to make our water resources better serve the needs of our people. If there are unnecesary, unwise or low priority projects included in this or similar bills, then I suggest the proper approach is not to condemn the legislation with the broad brush of "pork barrel" but to identify the projects that lack justification and seek to delete them on the basis of their individual lack of merit.

Among the provisions in which I am especially interested, Mr. Chairman, are the following:

First, the authorization of a Federal flood control project in the Elizabeth River Basin. As recommended by the Corps of Engineers, and approved by the committee, this project will cost a total of $12,200,000, of which $9,769,000 is the Federal share. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.3, and the appropriate Federal and State agencies have given the project their unanimous approval.

As the committee has indicated in its report, the Elizabeth River flood control project is necessary. Severe and destructive floods have been a recurrent problem, especially in the densely populated, heavily industrialized section of the river basin that lies in Union, Hillside, and Elizabeth. The recommended improvements will protect the basin against the worst floods on record, both fluvial and tidal, and such flooding at current costs would cause damage estimated at $3,700,000.

This is a most worthwhile project, Mr. Chairman, and one that the governing bodies, private organizations, and the people wholeheartedly support.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the widening of the entrance channel to Kill van Kull from upper New York Bay. The committee considers this project to be urgent for the safe and efficient use of the channel, and those who are familiar with the importance of the channel and its essential role in the huge commerce of the Port of New York and New Jersey will concur vigorously.

This one entrance channel carries no less than 50 percent of the waterborne commerce of the entire port area—a greater volume of traffic than is carried by any other coastal port in the United States.

The narrowness of the present entrance channel has caused an increasing number of collisions, groundings, and near accidents, and conditions there are considered critical especially in view of the bigger, heavier vessels now using the channel to reach Port Elizabeth and Port Newark in Newark Bay. Recognizing this fact, the Corps of Engineers has separated the Kill van Kull entrance project from its more comprehensive review of the New York-New Jersey Channels and in March of this year recommended to Congress that the entrance be widened from 800 to 1,400 feet at an estimated cost of $2,581,000.

This project, Mr. Chairman, is vital not only in the interests of safety and convenience but also of the continued growth of one of the world's busiest port areas, the rapidly developing facilities along the shores of Newark Bay.

Third, Mr. Chairman, I refer to the decision of the committee, which it has noted in its report on the bill, to report an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill every year, rather than every 2 to 4 years. This is a highly welcome change, and I applaud the committee for making it. As the report points out, when the report of a proposed project is transmitted to Congress following enactment of an omnibus bill, it has meant a further delay of 2, 3, or 4 years before the project is finally authorized—a delay which, in many cases, can be extremely costly.

One such case comes immediately to mind. The single most important current project in the whole New York-New Jersey port area—the largest in the world—is the overhaul of navigation channels in Newark Bay. This is the center of the greatest growth in the port area, focusing chiefly on the development of Port Elizabeth and Port Newark which, when completed, will be the largest terminals in the port. Waterborne commerce in Newark Bay already exceeds 10 million tons annually, with an estimated value of $6 billion.

The principal factor in the growth of the area's commerce has been the increase in the movement of deep-draft vessels which, in order to operate at capacity, require deeper and wider channels than are now available. The Corps of Engineers, which has completed its preliminary report on this project, is expected to recommend major improvements in the Newark Bay channels. Final transmittal of a favorable report has, however, been impossible prior to action on the pending bill. Without the announced decision of the committee to consider annual authorization bills, therefore, this extremely significant project would be consigned to several more years of limbo, and at a time when the improvements are critically needed. The Port of New York Authority alone is investing hundreds of millions of dollars in port facilities on Newark Bay. Port Newark now employs more than 4,500 people with an annual payroll exceeding $25 million. When completed, Port Elizabeth will employ an estimated 9,500 people earning more than $52 million a year.

These figures, I think you will agree, suggest the tremendous importance to the economy of our area of the proposed projects for the improvement of channels in Newark Bay. And for this reason, we are grateful to the committee for its decision which will save years in providing the improvements so badly needed.

Fourth, and finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to add my strong endorsement of title I of the bill—a triumph of imagination and determination, far and away the most important single effort so far devised in Congress to do something effective about solving the critical water shortage problem in the Northeast. This one title makes the present bill historically important and presents the Congress with an unprecedented opportunity to set in motion a series of studies which will result, hopefully, in the construction of a comprehensive, regionwide system of reservoirs, completely interrelated with each other and fully integrated with existing facilities. Such a system is our only assurance that on a long-term basis the most heavily populated, most intensely industrialized section of the United States will have enough water to meet its increasing and essential needs.

Consequently, I hope the House will give this new and far-reaching title the strongest possible support. And while I do not wish to be a part of what seems to be an interagency tug of war, or a battle for power over the development of the Northeast's water resources, I must express my deep regret that the administration, according to reliable reports, opposes title I. I know of no substantive reason for this alleged opposition, nor can I understand what seems to me the completely groundless opposition of the Delaware River Basin Commission. Title I simply authorizes the Corps of Engineers to prepare a plan to meet the Northeast region's future water supply needs. Every individual project resulting from the Engineers' study would have to go through the full authorization and appropriation process. The fears of the commission and, apparently, of the administration, appear in this light to be quite groundless.

I hope, therefore, that the House will reject any amendment to delete or substantially change title I. In particular, I hope we will not be influenced to transfer the authority to make the study and prepare the plan from the Corps of Engineers to another agency which may not possess the resources, the experience, the operating capacity or the legal authority to carry out this huge responsibility.

All of us, Mr. Chairman, agree that the time for action is now, both on a long-term and short-term basis. Title I represents a carefully calculated response to the long-term need. It would be very unfortunate to lose sight of our mutual objective and allow ourselves to get

bogged down in essentially extraneous and irrelevant considerations and lose this great opportunity to get moving.

Tens of millions of people in northeast New Jersey, New York, Philadelphia, and the wide region surrounding this giant metropolitan center have been brought to the brink of disaster by the present drought. We simply cannot wait any longer to do what we all know must be done. We have paid lip service to the need during the weeks and months of the emergency. Now is the time to back up our words with our votes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield ?

Mrs. DWYER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I would like to commend the gentlewoman from New Jersey for the very effective testimony she presented to our Subcommittee on Flood Control on the Elizabeth River Basin project. She was one of the most persuasive witnesses who came before our subcommittee during the entire hearing.

Mrs. DWYER. Thank you very much. I certainly appreciate that remark.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the chairman and the members of the committee and the appropriate subcommittees thereof for bringing this bill to the floor.

The water problems of the Nation are becoming increasingly serious. This is the proper medium for seeking solutions to those problems.

I asked for this time primarily to discuss projects which have been recommended for authorization by the Corps of Engineers since the bill was reported. This organization has, as of last Friday, recommended the approval by the Congress of authorization for 12 additional projects. One of these is a project in which I am very keenly interested. It is the Gulf County Canal project which is found in the First District of Florida. It is not a costly project, the Federal share is something under a half million dollars, but it connects the Gulf Intracoastal Canal with the port of St. Joe and St. Joseph's Harbor, Fla., and as such serves a very important purpose to an industrial community. It would be my hope that these newly recommended projects could be included in the present bill. However, I am mindful of the fact that they total something over $150 million. I am somewhat reluctant to assume the responsibility of asking the committee to open the door for one, because I realize it is tanamount to opening the door for all of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I could have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee at this point. First of all, I am told that the committee proposes to have an annual authorization bill. I would certainly hope that this is going to be the case, because we have waited three years for the present omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill and that 3-year wait has been a very taxing and trying time for some of us who had meritorious and worthwhile projects which have needed authorization and construction. However, in addition, I understand the present bill carries language which permits the committee itself to authorize projects of less than one-half million dollars in cost without the necessity for congressional action. The Federal contribution to the project to which I refer would be $470,000. If I can yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, am I correct in the assumption which I stated.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. Your statement is absolutely correct.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask my distinguished friend, who has contributed much to good legislation in this and other fields, whether it is the intention of the committee to handle expeditiously projects such as the one to which I have referred, which has been recommended and which is less than half a million dollars in cost so that there will be no necessity for these projects to have to wait for another omnibus rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is exactly the purpose. It is a great inequity and does great injustice. There are many projects of small and modest size which are completely worthwhile and about which there is no question whatsoever, but they have to wait for 2 or 3 or 4 years in the committee for an omnibus bill.

But through no fault of their own, year after year numerous projects are suggested, such as the gentleman has mentioned here, that are put in the "deep freeze." So our thought would be this, that the smaller type projects could be put right out. They would not be bypassing anything. They would have to meet all of the criteria and go through all the steps and the processes, and some of them might take several years, such as any other projects may take.

We hope to have and we do intend to have an omnibus bill each year from now on.

Mr. SIKES. Certainly this will improve the procedure for handling these matters. The gentleman has been most reassuring. Before I yielded the floor may I respectfully remind my good and distinguished friend that I am talking about the Gulf County Canal in Florida.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit a question to the chairman of the committee. As he knows, on the North Coast of California we were hit very hard by tidal waves. If I understand this correctly—and I should like his comments on it, however—with this new concept in the bill itself, those projects on the North Coast of California will qualify to come before the committee each year, providing they qualify otherwise?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following those of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I concur in what the gentleman has said. As I understand, the Gulf County Canal has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and the Corps of Engineers. I do not think there will be any problem getting it authorized expeditiously.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for my distinguished friend's comments. It is a needed project which I trust will have early and favorable action by the committee.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in support of S. 2300, authorizing funds for river and harbor and flood control projects, I want to call attention to two projects which are included in the bill and deserve approval.

And in this connection I want to commend the Committee on Public Works. I know that members of the committee have spent many many hours of diligent, thorough, and hard work studying the various projects submitted to them. The American people owe much to this committee.

The Gulf Coast of Alabama has some of the finest fishing and recreational potential of any coast area of the country. Part of the area has been developed, but other parts need improvements so that the potential which is there can be fully realized in terms of both added economic strength and in terms of recreational values which the country is coming more to appreciate with each passing year.

One of the important commercial fishing and pleasure boat areas along the Gulf Coast of Alabama is Bayou La Batre which extends from the sea inland approximately 24,000 feet to the town of the same name. The town of Bayou La Batre is 30 miles southwest of Mobile.

The channel should be maintained at a depth of 9 feet by previous authorization. However over the years it has difficult to maintain that depth, with the result that serious difficulty has been encountered by craft of various kinds in negotiating from the community to the sea.

Many individuals depend on this navigation for their livelihood. An extensive industry in shrimp, oysters and other seafood revolves around the fishing activity made possible by the Bayou itself.

In July 1964, the Corps of Engineers recommended a 12-foot channel for Bayou La Batre. To implement that recommendation an item of $262,000 is included in this bill.

The 12-foot channel will bring solid opportunity for development along the waterway and in the community of Bayou La Batre. People there have been master boat builders for generations but many orders have been lost

for the lack of a satisfactory access to the sea.

There are no better fisherman anywhere than in this area. And yet when they come in with a successful catch they often must unload in neighboring areas because they cannot get into their own port without tearing the bottom out of their boats.

The improved navigational opportunities will mean recreational advantages as well. Sport fishing and pleasure boating are swiftly increasing as major recreational activities.

And while a few years ago the country considered recreational needs to be unimportant or even foolish, the time is fast coming when we consider adequate recreational facilities to be essential to the economy as well as to the full life which we as Americans seek.

The second item I want to mention today is the Perdido Pass channel. This channel is located about half way between Mobile and Pensacola, and forms part of the boundary between Alabama and Florida.

The bill provides $625,000 for work in establishing a 12-foot channel between Perdido Pass and the Gulf of Mexico, and a 9-foot channel from the Pass to Perdido Bay, and also a 9-foot channel into Terry Cove.

There has been no Federal project involved here before. The navigable depth in many places is less than 4 feet. And craft requiring greater depths must use routes several miles away. Only in calm weather can the Perdido route be used at all without hazardous conditions.

The project includes non-Federal participation in the amount of $471,000. Local interests are especially interested in this improvement as a means of realizing the great commercial fishing potential of the area and the sport fishing and pleasure boat activities as well.

Again I want to commend the work of the Committee on Public Works and I welcome this progress toward needed improvements in the Bayou La Batre and the Perdido Pass channels.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I support S. 2300 and commend the able chairmen of the committee and its subcommittees for the splendid work they have done.

This bill looks to the future and endeavors to meet, in statesmanlike manner, the needs of our country in the years ahead.

A good example is afforded by inclusion in the bill of approval for Shidler Reservoir, on Salt Creek, in Oklahoma.

This reservoir is urgently needed by the communities of the area, and their future growth is dependent upon its construction.

I do not know of any community that has worked harder in support of a project than the city of Shidler, under the able leadership of Mayor G. L. Willis and civic leader Ben Jones. I share their conviction that the growth of their area will be advanced tremendously by Shidler Reservoir, and major flood control and recreational benefits will accompany the water conservation benefits.

I hope this bill will be overwhelmingly approved and an early start on the Shidler project will follow.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

(Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support S. 2300 and the language thereof as reported by the House Committee on Public Works. I entertain confidence in and great respect for the members of the committee, individually and collectively.

Emblazoned on the wall of the Chamber of the House of Representatives, directly above the chair occupied by the presiding officer, are the words of Daniel Webster:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

In the favorable consideration and passage of legislation such as we are now considering, we are following the instructions and the imperative of our predecessor, Mr. Webster. The consideration of the omnibus flood control and rivers and harbors bill is always one which brings us to a closer realization of the great strength of the natural resources of the United States.

Under the criteria established by the Congress and by the rules of the Committee on Public Works, the benefit-cost ratio of the projects listed in bills of this character must exceed unity. That means that every dollar authorized and eventually appropriated for the development of these natural resources is an investment in America and its future. May it always be so, so that each of us in our time may have contributed to the development and strengthening of our land, of our resources, and of our future.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the foresight and long-range vision which the Committee on Public Works has demonstrated by including the language of title I—Northeastern U.S. Water Supply—as appears on pages 37 and 38. All of us are well aware of the dangerous situation which has developed in New York and other parts of the northeastern United States, which has been caused by severe drought conditions.

An entire area comprising more than 20 million people is experiencing a dangerously low level of usable water supply for personal, residential, commercial and industrial purposes. This is a problem which affects not only the areas and the people involved, but affects the entire Nation.

The careful study and the excellent judgment of the committee is clearly demonstrated by the directions to prepare and plan to meet the long-range water needs of the United States. I strongly support this section as it is strong evidence of the necessity to develop and conserve our water resources.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to my friend from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] in expressing approval of the committee's action in placing into this bill this new concept of treating our Nation's critical water problem.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for including in his statement supporting this bill his approval of title I of the bill.

I believe there is no more important problem facing the United States today, at least domestically, than the short water supply that is developing year after year in various sections of the country.

I further believe it is well for us to recognize the problem in the northeastern section of the United States where the great population centers lie, and direct our initial studies to the problem in this area.

I am glad to join the gentleman not only in support of the entire bill but in speaking enthusiastically on this new concept in an effort to solve the water needs of the Northeast United States and with the hope that we point the way to avoid such critical circumstances in other sections of this country.

(Mr. LANDRUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, while approving of the bill as a whole, I particularly approve that portion contained on lines 11 through 21 on page 44 of the bill as reported to the House. Together with my colleagues in the other body, I have sponsored and advocated this legislation in fulfillment of a promise which I made to my friends and neighbors when I first campaigned for election to Congress. I believe in river development as a proper Federal function and as part of a comprehensive plan of resource conservation and the development of hydroelectric power.

I believe that I have the unanimous support of the Georgia delegation in the House in behalf of the authorization of the two Flint River projects which are designated as the Lazer Creek project and the Lower Auchumpkee project. On their behalf, as well as on my own, I respectfully urge the passage of this authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be an expert on many subjects. I seldom trespass upon the time of this House in floor debate. However, if there is any subject upon which I do claim more than a modicum of general knowledge, it is the subject of the Flint River, Ga., and its development. The Flint River is as dear and close to me as the Chattahoochee must have been to our great Georgia poet, Sidney Lanier, when he wrote the "Song of the Chattahoochee." The Flint River rises a few miles north of my home. It flows through my native county and is crossed by the very highway on which my residence is located and where four generations of my family have lived and

made their home. From earliest boyhood, I have fished and swum in its waters. I have hiked, picnicked, camped, cooked, and slept along its banks. I have floated down it and portaged over its shoals from the place where it is wide enough to accommodate a boat to its confluence with the Chattahoochee.

Ever since the Congress became conscious of the great potential of river development, I have envisioned multipurpose development of the Flint River within and adjacent to the Sixth District of Georgia. Upon the passage of this bill today, the authorization of the second and third dams of the three-dam complex will become a reality.

The House of Representatives authorized the construction of the uppermost of these three dams, known as the Spewrell Bluff Dam, in the act approved December 30, 1963. This legislation today authorizes the construction of the two companion projects which form this complex.

The falling waters of the Flint River will be utilized three times within 30 river miles for the generation of hydroelectric power. These dams will harness flood waters and prevent flood damage over thousands of acres and many miles of river basin. These three dams will form the necessary reservoirs which will provide a continuous flow of deep water and will eventually make possible navigation of the lower reaches of the Flint River above Bainbridge and as far north as Albany, Ga., as a part of the plan designed by the Corps of Engineers in 1963.

In 1836, the General Assembly of Georgia authorized a study of the Flint River with regard to navigation and appropriated $10,000 for the study. If electricity had been generated by hydroelectric plants at that time, no doubt the authorization would have included a reference to the study of the hydroelectric potential of this river.

In 1872, still before the era of electricity and hydroelectric power, the U.S. Congress authorized a Federal survey of the Flint River from Albany, Ga., to Chattahoochee, Fla.

In 1939, the civil works division of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army began preparation of a general plan for full development of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River System. In 1948, the Congress implemented this recommendation with general legislation authorizing further study and development of this system.

In 1961, the Corps of Engineers announced the beginning of a survey of Flint River to include a study of multiple hydroelectric sites.

In August 1962, the Corps of Engineers completed this study and prepared a report which, on September 20, 1962, was transmitted to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. The letter transmitting a favorable report of the detailed plan for comprehensive development of Flint River, Ga., to eventually include five dams, recommended immediate authorization of the upper three dams, namely: Spewrell Bluff, Lazer Creek, and Lower Auchumpkee projects. The following day, September 21, 1962, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK referred this report and letter to the Committee on Public Works and ordered it printed with illustrations as a House document. It was designated House Document No. 567, 87th Congress, 2d session.

Beginning in 1908, non-Federal agencies considered the hydroelectric potential of this river. Easements and other properties have been acquired in possible anticipation of such development, but no further action was taken.

As a candidate for election to an unexpired term in the 83d Congress, I spoke of the development of this river and its basin, and pledged that if elected I would seek the enactment of authorizing legislation. One of the first actions taken by me after becoming a Member of this House was to generate additional activity which resulted in the preparation and submission of the report of the Chief of Engineers which is incorporated in House Document No. 567, 87th Congress, which report forms the basis for this authorization.

To the best of my knowledge, this section of the bill reported by the Committee on Public Works meets with the practically unanimous approval of the people of the sixth and adjoining districts. Local interest, local officials, and local citizens have joined together in endorsing and asking approval of the Flint River development. I am confident that I can give assurance that the local cooperation required under the terms of the report which accompanies this bill will be enthusiastically provided.

I urge the authorization of this development on the Flint River, Ga., within the language approved by the Committee on Public Works. The comprehensive plan of water resource development of the Flint River Basin consists of five dams and reservoirs for general approval as a guide to the resource development of the Flint River Basin. Congress authorized the Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir as the first step in the recommended plan in the 88th Congress, and such authorization is contained in the Flood Control Act approved December 30, 1963. The language contained in S. 2300 authorizes the Lazer Creek project and the lower Auchumpkee project.

The authorization of the Lazer Creek project and the Lower Auchumpkee project to include a dam and reservoir at each location constitutes the next logical step in this comprehensive plan and development, and these projects and their authorization are consistent with orderly processes and the rules and procedures of the House of Representatives.

I wholeheartedly approve this entire plan and urge authorization at this time of the Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee projects, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 567 of the 87th Congress.

The comprehensive development of the Flint River Basin has the potential of further developing the economy of this entire area.

Flint River rises 350 miles above its mouth and 1,000 feet above mean sea level in the southerly outskirts of Atlanta, Ga., the largest city in the Southeast. It crosses the fall line, marking the division of the Piedmont Plateau and the Coastal Plain, between river miles 230 and 285, falling 370 feet in 55 miles. It joins the Chattahoochee River to form the Apalachicola River, 108 miles above Apalachicola Bay, an arm of the Gulf of Mexico.

The power needs of the Flint River Basin are increasing rapidly and continuously. Power from projects on the Flint River could be used in power supply areas 23 and 24 as designated by the Federal Power Commission. Annual flood damages below the fall line total $180,000, and productive values of farm and urban land will increase substantially when flood control is provided.

The estimated costs of the two projects are as follows: The Lazer Creek project is estimated to cost $41,028,000, of which $40,378,000 are Federal funds and $650,000 are non-Federal funds. The Lower Auchumpkee project is estimated to cost $49,295,000, of which $48,275,000 are Federal funds and $1,020,000 are non-Federal funds.

The benefit-cost ratios of the Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee projects are 1.2 and 1.3 respectively. The total annual benefits of the two projects is $5,885,000, compared to annual charges of $4,737,000.

Broken down into each individual project, the annual benefits to be derived from the Lazer Creek project total $2,725,000. The annual benefits of the Lower Auchumpkee Dam and Reservoir are shown by the engineers to be $3,160,000. By comparison, the annual charges of the Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee projects are $2,228,000 and $2,509,000, respectively.

The benefit-cost ratio of each of these projects is well above the standard and criteria heretofore established by the Committee on Public Works and the Congress.

In addition to the economic benefits, the beauty of a truly delightful area of Georgia will be multiplied by the reservoirs which will come into being as a result of this legislation. The often-muddy waters of the Flint River will be transformed into the clear blue lakes which will find their ways up creeks and into coves at the place where the northernmost Spanish moss meets the southernmost trailing arbutus. Citizens of our time and generation, as well as those who will take our places, will enjoy the facilities and the beauty, as well as reap the economic benefits of the projects which will be authorized by this legislation which we shall pass today.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely and enthusiastically support this legislation, and urge its passage by the House of Representatives.

I thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for his contribution and I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank my colleague and longtime friend for yielding.

(Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300, the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors, Beach Erosion, and Flood Control Act of 1965.

S. 2300 is the first legislation of this nature which has been reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Public Works during my service as a Member of this body. It has been my pleasure to appear before the Committee on Public Works and its subcommittees. In this way, I have seen the manner in which the members of this committee apply themsleves to the consideration of and development of the legislative language which is incorporated into a bill of this kind. From them and through them I have learned the standards and criteria which individual projects must meet in order to be included in legislation and recommended by the Committee on Public Works.

A careful study and analysis of this legislation as a whole and by its component parts leads one to the unmistakable conclusion that the great public works which come into being as a result of legislation sponsored by this committee are investments in the future of America.

The individual projects contained in this legislation are naturally of great importance to the Representatives and people of the area in which the respective projects are located. In addition to such local significance as each item in this bill may have, altogether this bill represents the result of careful study and demonstrated good judgment in this development of the resources of this country and the conservation of those resources.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill in its entirety. I especially support that section which appears under the heading of Flint River Basin—Georgia—in the exact language in which it was reported by the committee.

The general plan of development of the Flint River Basin includes five river development projects, three in the upper reaches and two in the lower reaches of the Flint River. Of the three upper dams, the Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir was authorized in the act approved December 30, 1963. This bill now under consideration will authorize the next two projects, Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee, in the order recommended by the Chief of Engineers, as reported to the Congress in House Document No. 567, 87th Congress.

A map study of Georgia will quickly show that each of the three above-mentioned projects are located in districts other than the Second District of Georgia. However, more river miles of Flint River are located in the Second District of Georgia than either of the other districts through which the Flint River flows.

One purpose of the three upper projects is to provide water storage and holding effect in order to maintain the constant source of water to fully utilize the lower reaches of the Flint River and to justify the authorization of two additional projects in the lower reaches of the Flint River, known as Raccoon Creek project and Lower Vada project. It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will recommend and that the Congress will authorize early development of the two downstream projects.

With this in view, and in the firm belief that the Flint River projects which are contained and described in this legislation are of great and lasting importance to the State of Georgia and the Nation, I wholeheartedly support the provision of S. 2300 and especially endorse the authorizing language for the two Flint River projects.

I respectfully urge that the bill be passed and that any amendments to that portion relating to the Flint River, Ga., to change the language recommended by the Committee on Public Works be rejected.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

(Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I expect that today there will be considerable discussion concerning some parts of this omnibus public works bill. The power-producing sections are creating the controversies and should bring the entire House to question why they are there at all.

There is little question about the beach erosion, flood control, river dredging, and similar projects of the bill designed to benefit the citizens of a number of areas, and doing for them something which neither they nor private business can do independently. But once again the time of the Members of the House is to be consumed in protracted debate about power-producing projects that have no business being there in the first place.

My patience begins to wear thin when I see an endless stream of Interior Department reports attempting to indicate that there are power shortages here, high costs there, and insufficient power for what has been intriguingly called preference customers—although I am at a loss as to why some preferred people in this land should have a special advantage in getting power produced by facilities which were paid for by all the taxpayers.

And yet, at the same time I am told on the very best of authority. that our investor-owned electric companies are outstripping the Russians and the world in power supply and technology—something in the order of 3 or 4 to 1—and gaining every day. Other than some limited technological instances, I know of nowhere in this great land where people are throwing their electric switches and not getting instantaneous results—24 hours a day, 365 days a year. I am not an expert on the electric utility business, but it seems to me that these companies have been doing a truly outstanding job in anticipating what the American people will want tomorrow, and next week, and a decade from now for their electric requirements—and then going out and providing them.

The costs of power? What is it, Mr. Chairman, that leads some of the agencies of the administration, in both Democratic and Republican administrations, to constantly challenge the costs of electric power? Certainly there are parts of the Nation where electricity costs more than in others. There are also places where coal and bread and oil and butter and pork and chickens cost more than in some others. Yet, so far as I know no one has seriously proposed that the Government go into the oil business or the butter business.

Maybe I do not understand the economics here, but it seems that something is awry somewhere. The costs of most of these other items to the consumer has gone up and we make no attempts to inject the Government or offer subsidies to the poor consumer. At the same time the electric industry has been constantly reducing the cost of its product and we attempt to rush in and improve its performance by massive doses of Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, I pose a serious question to the Members of the Committee of the Whole. How many products can you name that cost your constituents less today than a decade or two ago? There are very few indeed, but electricity is one of them.

Certainly everyone wants to continue that trend. We might think about, as well, ways to spread and accelerate that trend to other products—it might well be a more worthwhile expenditure of the House's time to do that than constantly to berate and encroach on an industry that is the Nation's largest taxpayer.

Let me take just a moment more to point out exactly what I mean. Examining that Dickey-Lincoln School project in this bill leads me to actual astonishment. Can it really be true that we are being asked to authorize some $300 million in expenditure for a project that will be obsolete when it is built? Are we truly being asked to give our blessing to a project that will be detrimental to other parts of the country and will do nothing to lower power costs in New England but will provide only temporary assistance to the depressed parts of the State of Maine? Can there really be people who feel the Congress of the United States is foolish enough to say "yes" to a project that will slow down the development of nuclear power in New England, the best hope in generations for lower cost power for all the people of that area? Are we really in the process of spending $300 million to land another blow at Appalachia and its coal industry when such a short time ago we appropriated money to help this very area.

What this project will really do is to fill part of New England's growing needs for power with an overly expensive project, which may produce power more cheaply than obsolete steamplants, but which will produce more expensive power than nuclear or coal plants that can be built today. The benefits will be concentrated on so-called preference customers. The majority of New Englanders will get this power on a—you can have what is left over—basis. If a com-

pany tried to give the economies of a new low-cost plant to a few preferred customers, the New England regulatory commissions would promptly put a stop to the practice. But the Federal Government is immune from State regulation and by constructing this project can give preferred treatment to a few, while taking away part of the New England companies' load growth, a load growth which—without Federal intervention—would permit companies to build new low-cost facilities and spread the benefits over all New England.

The Flint River project is bad enough, several of the other power projects border on the unsound, but this massive project suggested for Maine is a tremendously expensive stalking horse for the now discredited Passamaquoddy project. It is a horse that I do not care to buy or even ride. If we find ourselves authorizing such a massive part of this Quoddy project, what is to stop us next year or the year after from buying the whole scheme? The original estimates were in the vicinity of over a billion dollars. But, apparently, there still remains some semblance of economic logic with us to cause, at least, its delay. Instead, a new horse appears, but its teeth are not much better than the shoddy Quoddy nag. Perhaps to the people of Maine it is a gift horse and not to be looked in the mouth. But to the rest of the Nation it is a poor buy indeed.

Mr. Chairman, let us be honest with one of America's greatest sources of strength—our electric industry. Let us be honest, too, with the people of Maine. Let us reject this St. John River project—as it should be rejected by all the rules of logic—and then let us do something for the people of Maine that makes sense. Something that will have a lasting benefit for Maine and the rest of New England. Let us return this St. John River project to the committee or even better, eliminate this dead horse once and for all.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY].

(Mr. CALLAWAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the development of the Flint River Basin is of great importance to me.

The comprehensive plan for the development of the basin consists of five dams and reservoirs. The Spewell Bluff Dam and Reservoir has already been authorized by the Congress as the first step.

This omnibus bill contains the second step, the authorization of the Lazer Creek and Lower Ochumpkee Dams.

Three of the four counties in which the two dams are located are in my district, the Third District of Georgia. Most of the waters of the proposed reservoirs lie in my district. And I want to say that the citizens of my district are overwhelmingly in favor of the prompt development of this river.

With the development of this great natural resource, the citizens of the Third District will reap the benefits of additional peaking power, of much needed flood control, and of a recreational area in one of the most beautiful sections of the South.

The total annual benefits of the projects as determined by the Corps of Engineers are $5,885,000, compared to annual charges of $4,737,000.

In my opinion, the development of the Flint River will have a long-range significant effect on the growth of our State and our region, and I wholeheartedly support the adoption of this portion of the bill.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

(Mr. DOLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to ask one or two questions with reference to the John Martin Dam and Reservoir and the permanent pool which is to be authorized by language contained in this bill commencing on page 53, and ending on page 54. The John Martin Reservoir and the permanent pool, not to exceed 10,000 acre-feet, are discussed on page 74 of the committee report. This dam was authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936. Since May 31, 1949, the waters of the Arkansas River impounded behind the dam are controlled and apportioned by the Arkansas River Compact and administered by the Arkansas River Compact Administration as established by the compact.

The administration consists of three members from Colorado, three members from Kansas, and an ex officio Federal member who acts as chairman. Two of the Kansas members, Mr. Logan N. Green, of Garden City, Kans., and Mr. Carl E. Bentrup, of Deerfield, Kans., reside in my congressional district, and along with Mr. R. V. Smrha, chief engineer, Division of Water Resources, Kansas State Board of Agriculture, have expressed some concern about the permanent pool provision. They are principally concerned with protecting irrigation interests downstream from the dam and particularly in the State of Kansas.

I take this time to ask whether or not the establishment of this permanent pool of some 10,000 acre-feet will in any way affect the rights of the irrigators now in the State of Kansas?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to point out that the bill on pages 53 and 54 states specifically "the rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River Compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph."

That is reiterated even more strongly in the committee report. Therefore it is the clear intention of the committee that the rights in these compacts will in no way be diminished or reduced by this particular section of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Do I understand there have been no field hearings on this particular project?

Mr. BALDWIN. There have been no field hearings, but we did hold hearings in Washington on this project.

Mr. DOLE. It is then the clear intent of this committee not to diminish the present rights of the downstream irrigators.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentleman. My concern is that Kansas water users are not deprived of any portion of the water to which they are presently entitled under the terms of the compact; and while I understand the language in the bill clearly indicates their rights will be protected, it does seem that some provision should be made to insure that in actual practice the rights of the irrigators are preserved. Certainly the interested parties in Kansas have no objection to all possible utilization of available waters, but we cannot approve any form of supplemental agreement without formal sanction of Congress and the original negotiating parties. In other words, the compact is the controlling instrument notwithstanding anything contained in the bill or the language of the report. Again, I thank the gentleman from California for confirming the clear intent of the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY] 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, concern has been expressed in upstate New York regarding the possibilities that waters which ordinarily would flow into Lake Ontario, one of the already low-level lakes would be withheld under the farsighted Jones plan.

I think two points should be made for the RECORD in this connection. One is that each project outlined in the plan would return here to the Congress for authorization so that we would review each project. Second, as the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], has assured me this whole plan is based on the theory of riparian rights so that if one State found a project would injure its riparian rights, it could object.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this points up a very urgent problem, the problem of low levels in the Great Lakes and the concern that is expressed is occasioned by the fact that the levels of the lakes are already low. The only answer is to put more water into the lakes. There is only one place that this water can come from and that is from Canada. Until recently the Canadians were very loath to consider any plan involving the diversion of any of their waters into the Great Lakes to raise the water levels and to flush out pollutants. Recently, however, there has been a change of attitude.

I recently introduced a resolution which would declare it to be the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States refer this matter to the International Joint Commission with a

request that the so-called great replenishment plan for channeling rivers that flow into Hudson Bay and rechanneling them into the Great Lakes be studied and that studies be undertaken with reference to the economic feasibility of such a project as well as the engineering problems involved.

I would hope as we consider the idea of diverting waters from the Great Lakes to the drought stricken Atlantic seaboard, we in the Congress give serious consideration to the binational plan of the United States and Canada, to divert these northern Canadian rivers that now flow out and gush unused millions of gallons of water daily into Hudson Bay to be rechanneled into the Great Lakes to raise the level and flush out pollutants, and thus provide for the increasing water needs of the States of Illinois, Ohio, and New York.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman.

[Mr. BURKE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BURKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL].

(Mr. CABELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, may I rise in support of the pending bill, S. 2300. I would call the attention of this committee to two very distinguishing characteristics of this bill, characteristic of the entire bill but particularly applicable to the projected development of the Trinity River Basin. One is that the bill meets every criteria of good legislation and good public works in that it ties into a package both local, State, and Federal participation in those areas of responsibility of the governmental subdivisions involved.

I rise also to call attention to the very distinguishing feature that this recognizes the need for looking ahead and keeping pace with the growth of our economy and the growth of our population so as not to let any portion of our community or any portion of the Nation to lag behind in some of the facilities that are so necessary and essential to their well-being.

May I thank the Members of this Committee and the members of the subcommittees who have worked so diligently on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge most respectfully the support of this Committee for this very fine bill.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

If section 201, which is included in the bill, survives today, I wonder if the gentleman would tell me whether it would apply to a specific problem in my district. As the gentlemen knows, a community in my district, Klamath, was entirely wiped out during the floods of 1964. There is a very serious emergency, in that the State of California is actually holding up the construction of a highway which they intend to use for levee purposes in order to protect the new location of the community against future floods. The Corps of Engineers now has a project underway to relocate the community, and the matter will come before the committee once it has cleared the agencies. The State of California has already approved the project and it is scheduled to clear the agencies in the near future.

Might I have some assurance from the Chairman that as soon as the project clears the agencies, and as soon as the bill is passed, we can have a hearing on the project shortly after the first of the year?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I can only speak for the subcommittee. Certainly it would be our intention to address ourselves to any proposition that would be raised in the prospectus transmitted to us by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. We have a very short season for construction in this northern part of California and I want all of the Members of this House to understand the problem of the people of the Klamath area who are at the mercy of the Congress for assistance in this case. The future of these people and their community is at stake. They desire to relocate the site of the town. I have been working closely with the State of California, the Del Norte Board of Supervisors, and the people concerned, as we do everything within our power to advance this critical project.

I will be following up on this request in our committee.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take a bit of time to discuss with the Committee, particularly my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], details relative to the Mankato and North Mankato flood control project. I might comment at this point that my good friend of long standing, the senior Member of our Minnesota delegation, has been most helpful to me in this matter. I am most appreciative. His counsel and help I know are also appreciated by the citizens of Mankato and North Mankato.

Many Members will recall the devastating floods that hit Minnesota earlier this year. At Mankato much of the city was under water. Terrible damage resulted from one of the worst floods in Minnesota's history. The story was reported nationwide.

Back in 1958, a flood control project at Mankato and North Mankato was approved by the Congress, but the local jurisdictions failed to take advantage of the authorization because of some difficulties in meeting the requirements under the bill for local participation. But last spring the flood hit, and the damage was devastating. I know there was a big four-motor plane which flew all the way from Washington carrying officials who wished to observe the flood conditions. I know that politicians shoveled to fill sandbags, flash bulbs were flashing all over the place, and promises were made of many things which were going to be done.

It was my belief that in view of the fact that this project had been authorized, and in view of the fact that the local people have already started to build levees to prevent a similar disaster next spring, language should be included in this omnibus bill which would permit them to take credit for the dollars they presently spend against the requirement for local contribution. This is the purpose of the bill which I introduced earlier in this session. This is a fair request. I hope it will be granted.

I have in my hand a letter from the Army Engineers dated September 8 in which they indicate that they needed no further information upon which to base their report on my bill and had forwarded their report to the Budget Bureau for clearance. But I am advised that the Budget Bureau has not at this time made a report to the committee, and the committee is not at fault because the Budget Bureau did not submit the report. I was advised that the committee would attempt to put some language in the bill which would reach a project such as this.

I am wondering, if I might inquire of my good friend, Mr. BLATNIK, if there is any possibility that the provisions of my proposal could be written into this bill because I know that the gentleman's sympathies are with me, for we have discussed this matter. I might say to the Members of Congress that JOHN and I, way back in 1940, served together in the Minnesota Senate; so we have common interests as far as our State is concerned on projects such as this one.

Mr. BLATNIK. I say to my colleague, my very dear friend for many years, it has certainly been a pleasure to work with him on many important projects, dating back to our early days in the Minnesota State Senate.

The gentleman from Minnesota has explained the situation absolutely correctly. As he stated, I have been more than sympathetic. I have been anxious, in view of the urgency of the need and the readiness of the people there to do more than their share to meet the local participation on the project. I was most hopeful that we would be able to get this into the omnibus bill now before us.

We did ask the Corps of Engineers about this. As the gentleman knows, these projects must go through the regular procedures. In forwarding the proj-

ect to the Bureau of the Budget, there were some modifications to the original authorizations, which apparently would increase the local cost. Instead of the estimated $50,000 or $60,000 under the original design for the project, with the additional improvements the local cost could be up to $200,00 or perhaps $300,000.

Mr. NELSEN. That is correct.

Mr. BLATNIK. As was explained to me, the Bureau of the Budget has not yet come up with a report on exactly what would be the local cost. It would be much higher than $50,000 or $60,000. Certainly it would be closer to, but probably not larger than, $200,000.

I have nothing more to say, except I have deep regret that the processing by the Bureau has not been completed. They have had this only 10 or 11 days, but certainly through no fault of ours and certainly no fault of the gentleman, who has been after us for months on this project. There is a crying need. There was a devastating flood which the people went through. I am sorry there is no more I can offer to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. I intend to offer an amendment to the bill, though I was earlier advised not to do so. I was also advised that the committee would attempt to do this. I am sure they would like to.

The thing which is—I hestitate to use the word "irritating," but it is true that I do not know of a politician in Minnesota who was not out there last spring, and I do not know where they found all of the cameras and all of the headlines.

This was a flood which was devastating. It was an emergency which could recur. The river is again rising. It is almost a flood situation now, with constant rain. They are putting in levees now. Some of those are being washed away.

It seems only fair, when the people are willing to dig into their own pockets to build the levees, that they should be given credit for what they have done when the Congress finally acts. We know we will get to that finally. Because of the delay, even this little time, it seems to me this is an emergency. Every politician of whom I know in the State promised to do something about it. Now we face the prospect of nothing being done. I feel we shall have failed if we do not do something at this time. I hope the Committee will adopt my amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it is hardly necessary to say that I urge support of this legislation, in view of what has happended in the past several days in my own congressional district in Louisiana, as related to Hurricane Betsy. You all know of this disaster. You have read about it in the newspapers. You have heard of it on the radio. You have seen it on television. It was highly dramatized by the personal appearance of the President himself, accompanied by members of the Louisiana delegation, the day after the hurricane struck the area.

In its wake, as Members well know, it left in excess of 70 dead and, according to the Governor of Louisiana, $1 billion worth of damages.

Practically my whole district in the lower section bordering on the Gulf of Mexico and the lower Mississippi River was wiped out. Town after town and community after community were laid bare; individuals losing their life's savings and their homes. It is hard to understand how they can recover from this disaster in their own lifetimes.

I mention this fact to you because of the urgency to focus attention on this needed authorization for a flood control system in this particular area. For many years now my distinguished colleague whose district abuts mine, Congressman BOGGS, and I have cooperated in urging the adoption of what is known as the Lake Pontchartrain flood control program. This program, which is authorized in the bill, through the understanding of the Committee on Public Works and its distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], who heard the testimony of my colleague and myself only a few weeks ago, was passed before our recent disaster. Not once did we think at that moment that such a terrible disaster as Hurricane Betsy would strike us, as we listened intently to the testimony of the engineers from the State of Louisiana and the Corps of Army Engineers who approved this project. I think it would not be stretching a point to indicate that if in the course of human events this project had been authorized several years ago much of this damage would not have occurred. Certainly many lives would have been saved. However, this is literally water over the dam. This is something in the past. We now come to the present and look to the future. I suggest that you take this one incident as an example, as a horrible illustration, if you please, of the necesssity and the urgency for expediting this legislation.

I am most pleased that in the future we can expect annual omnibus bills. I think the devastation wrought by Hurricane Betsy has clearly demonstrated that we cannot wait nor postpone from year to year efforts and preparations to eliminate as far as possible that which has happened to us in Louisiana.

My distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. JONES] has graciously consented to come to Louisiana over the weekend to see exactly what did happen there; to witness the devastation which is beyond description even by the most eloquent and adequate speakers or writers. The land was laid low, homes were razed, and people are still in evacuation centers as of today. All of this could not have been prevented. Certainly some of it could have been if we had only had in being and in effect this particular program authorized in this legislation and which my colleague from Louisiana and I have sponsored for so long a time. I do not wish to belabor the question or to trespass upon your time any longer, because it is not necessary. I express the appreciation of myself and the people who live in my community for the great assistance that has been given us at this moment by the Federal Government and the various Federal agencies. These people will be on this trip with our colleague from Alabama over the weekend. They will see for themselves exactly what happened. I hope remedial legislation will be offered not only in this area but certainly in more expansive measures. My colleague has already introduced some legislation in that regard. I think this is the time when we should look forward to the Federal Government to assist in areas which cannot be assisted by private enterprise, particularly insurance companies.

We have had wartime disasters. But what is more continuous, what hangs over our heads more permanently, are natural disasters. I have been living through hurricanes since 1915. This was the worst of all in our own State. Other States are being affected by tornadoes and floods.

I suggest that disaster insurance of this kind is what is needed. Also I suggest that we explore some means for alleviating the losses of and assisting those helpless individuals. Mighty as the Government is and mighty as has been its help, not one thin dime is to be given to these people down there. I do not advocate a grant, but I do take umbrage at any suggestion that help by the Federal Government will result in help to the individual, because it will not.

I ask my colleagues to give favorable consideration to and recognize the urgency of passing this bill at this particular time.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my sympathy for the situation of the gentleman from Louisiana, because those of us in the northwest part of the United States were affected in a similar way. With regard to the matter of a disaster insurance program he will be pleased to know that we are asking a Federal agency, possibly the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to conduct a study in depth and make a recommendation to the Congress, because I think he knows that those of us who have been affected by floods simply do not have any program that can be triggered into action to help the small individual who has lost everything.

I want to offer my support to him. I have already talked to the distinguished majority whip and offered assistance from my own experiences in California.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take just a few moments to express my appreciation to our distinguished colleagues, the members of the Public Works Committee, for their hard work and the fine job they have done in reporting S. 2300 to the House.

In addition to supporting the bill, and particularly that portion which affects the First District of Georgia, I wish at this time to associate myself with the

remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] in support of the Flint River project, as reported by the committee.

I would like to comment also on sections of this bill which are of vital interest to southeast Georgia. This, of course, is in reference to the inclusion of some $13 million for needed improvements at Savannah Harbor.

Since General Oglethorpe sailed up the Savannah River and founded Georgia's mother city in 1733, the Savannah Harbor has been the key to the development of much of Georgia. The harbor has made possible the development of numerous industries which depend almost solely on water transportation in their basic operations. The harbor is also important in the movement of military personnel and cargo for the defense of our Nation. The harbor has been used extensively during every war, and within the past month troops boarded ships at Savannah enroute to Vietnam.

Although State and private organizations have spent millions of dollars on new facilities at the harbor in recent years, its future growth depends greatly on this authorization bill.

With all of the fine facilities now available at the port, large ships must still enter and leave the harbor partially loaded because of an inadequate channel depth. The present width of 500 feet in the bar channel and 400 feet in the inner harbor are hazardous as larger ships attempt to pass during the existence of fog, crosswinds, or other unfavorable weather conditions. In the upper reaches of the harbor, shipping is seriously hampered by the 200-foot width and 30-foot depth of the channel. This narrow channel makes movement at night extremely hazardous and ships cannot attempt to pass in the channel.

This bill would provide for widening and increasing the depth of the channel and for construction of additional turning basins.

In addition, the bill also provides for the construction of a tidegate and sediment basin which would greatly improve the harbor, and, at the same time, substantially reduce the annual maintenance by the Corps of Engineers.

Because of the somewhat unusual nature of this harbor, constant shoaling takes place along the main shipping channel. This shoaling is a continuous hazard to navigation and requires constant dredging of the channel. Construction of the tidegate and sediment basin would greatly reduce this problem.

In view of the importance of this legislation to my district and to other districts throughout the Nation, I urge that it be approved by the House.

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to stress my support for S. 2300 now under consideration by the House of Representatives. I am particularly interested in the Burns Waterway Harbor project contained in title II of the bill. When completed, this port will introduce a new era of economic prosperity and progress for the State of Indiana. It will represent the dreams of many people in Indiana who have worked for a port for many years. The State of Indiana demonstrated its faith in the potential benefits of a deep-water port on Lake Michigan when the 1965 legislature allotted $25.6 million to begin construction of the port's breakwater and the dredging of the harbor. This indicates the willingness of Indiana to invest in its own future.

The Burns Harbor project is incorporated in S. 2300 through the wording used in my particular bill, H.R. 50. It stresses the desirable feature of authorizing the Federal Government to make a monetary contribution to the State of Indiana as a means of financial aid for building the port. This approach to a Federal-State relationship is not part of the Senate's version of S. 2300. Yet, the idea of a Federal reimbursement of funds to a State for a public works project has precedent. The Army Corps of Engineers has participated in such projects many times in the past. What is really needed is a clearly defined policy to guide future projects of this type. However, at present, I strongly advise that the reimbursement feature be kept in the bill so that the State of Indiana might progress toward attaining this goal of a public port at the Burns Waterway.

The House version of S. 2300 also includes an additional paragraph—pages 84 and 85—which reads:

> Neither this paragraph nor the construction authorized by this paragraph shall adversely affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana Dunes as a national lakeshore.

Mr. Chairman, this is a means of calling attention to the other side of a controversy which has been bothering Hoosiers for a long time. I am quite willing to accept this version of a "proviso" to show the importance of the dunes national lakeshore project. In fact, I have taken constructive steps to begin action on such a measure. The House Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, chaired by my colleague [Mr. RIVERS of Alaska], will conduct field hearings in Indiana on October 2 and 3 to review the merits of a national lakeshore park in the Indiana Dunes area as set out in my bill, H.R. 51. This, I feel, indicates more measurable progress toward gaining a national park than using unnecessary provisos in an omnibus public works bill. However, if it will insure passage of S. 2300 in its House form, I am willing to accept the compromise proviso as worded in the House version.

Indiana is interested in gaining both a port and a national lakeshore park. In my opinion, the best place to begin is with expedient passage of this omnibus public works bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS].

(Mr. KREBS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as one who comes from a part of the country that now is and has in the past suffered severely under these conditions, I also feel that the committee is to be commended for the comprehensive job it has done on this bill and I urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of my 12th Congressional District in New Jersey know only too well that this had indeed been a long, dry summer.

To many communities of northern New Jersey, the specter of water rationing is no longer a mere threat. Some of my constituents have already begun to put into operation their own hurriedly prepared conservation and water retention facilities. Indeed, in many communities we have returned to the rain barrel technique of what we thought were days gone by.

Our rich industrial complex of the Northeast need not have to rely on rain barrels, Mr. Chairman. Congress, therefore, should not hesitate to accept our responsibility in replacing the rain barrel with reservoirs and aqueducts. I am convinced that Members of this Congress in approving S. 2300 will provide authority for regional planning that will insure a water supply for the long-range needs of our northeastern communities.

This planning is a necessity not only to guarantee the best possible use of available resources, but to insure wherever possible that the spectre of water-rationing will not for long haunt the thriving communities of the northeastern megalopolis.

It is my fervent wish that the majority of my colleagues in Congress support S. 2300 and the commitment to safeguard the future water supplies of our communities that have so generously contributed to the economic progress of the Nation.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER].

(Mr. TUPPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in general debate on S. 2300, argued that because the Dickey-Lincoln School project is located in the State of Maine, the low-cost power from it will be utilized to develop the industrial potential of that State at the expense of other States. Nothing could be further from the truth. He asks if this is a subsidy or an investment. The answer certainly is that this is an investment in the resources of Maine to the benefit of all our people.

These multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects are regional developments and in the larger sense are designed to benefit the Nation as a whole rather than any particular State or locality. Nor does it necessarily follow that merely because the industrial potential of Maine is developed that of other States is depleted. No modern nation in history has enjoyed the tremendous economic expansion and the rapidity of industrial development which the United States has experienced in the past few years and which we all hope will continue in the years to come. This unprecedented growth means that all areas which pos-

sess the necessary raw ingredients will enjoy the prosperity of increased industrialization. It is not a matter of one State developing industry at the expense of another State, but rather of providing basic elements essential to the continued industrial development of a region. Where these elements are available, the economy will develop.

One of these indispensable elements is low-cost electricity. The simple truth is that New England electricity rates are the highest in the Nation and those of the State of Maine the highest of the New England States. No sustained coherent and well organized plan has been developed by the existing private power interests to bring about lower cost electricity for the residential, commercial, and industrial consumers of the region which are paying these rates. To the extent that the Dickey-Lincoln School development will make available 694,000 kilowatts of electricity at a wholesale rate lower than that anywhere available in New England at the present time with the possible exception of St. Lawrence power in Vermont, it will supply a basic element necessary to revitalize the economy of the area. History demonstrates clearly that the advent of low-cost Federal power creates an element of competition in the power industry which inexorably results in all power suppliers offering parallel service at lower rates. No New England private power company will be put out of business or damaged by the Dickey-Lincoln School project. Competition—yes, but damage—no. As a matter of fact, private power companies located close to Federal power dams have enjoyed a rate of growth and a rate of profit which exceeds that of the industry as a whole.

Finally, with respect to the specific charge that authorization and construction of the Dickey-Lincoln School project will result in a transfer of industry from southern New England to northern New England, I respectfully but urgently emphasize that the plan for this project, as envisioned by the Department of the Interior, includes construction by the Federal Government, if necessary, of a transmission line from the project site to Boston, Mass. The only purpose for including this line in the project plan is to assure the people of all New England States that the benefits of the project will not be limited to Maine but will be made available on a regionwide basis.

There is, therefore, no merit whatever in arguments and contentions to the effect that the Dickey-Lincoln School project would result in the industrial development of one State at the expense of another. There is plenty of peaking power in the project for many States—there is no intent on the part of any one State to exercise a monopoly on its use.

For too long New England has complained about the benefits of low-cost power in other regions. Someone once said it is better to light a candle than to complain about the dark. Let us light this one candle and banish some of the high-cost darkness from New England.

I will submit other facts favorable to the Dickey-Lincoln School project before debate closes on S. 2300.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, the distinguished majority whip [Mr. BOGGS].

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my distinguished colleague from the First District of Louisiana has graphically described the damage inflicted upon our State by this devastating hurricane.

Upon returning here last week I made a report, attempting to estimate at least to some extent the amount of damage. Even then the amount of damage was very difficult to estimate. We are very fortunate indeed that the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman JONES, and his colleagues on this great committee, are going to our State and will be working over this weekend so they can ascertain just how bad and how devastating this natural disaster has been.

Mr. Chairman, this has been, in terms of loss of property, the worst natural disaster that we have ever experienced. In terms of the loss of life, it has been much less tragic than many other storms that we have experienced.

In 1893, for instance, as the result of a hurricane there were 2,000 people lost in the State of Louisiana. And, again, as late as 1957, if my memory serves me correctly, there were 500 people drowned in southwest Louisiana in a hurricane which hit Cameron Parish.

Mr. Chairman, in this last hurricane it is estimated that between a quarter of a million and one-half million people were evacuated from Congressman HÉBERT'S district, from Congressman WILLIS' district, mine, and others in the State of Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, whereas, there is nothing one can to do bring consolation and comfort to the people who lost their lives in Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana, at least we can take consolation in the fact that we have progressed to the point where rather than losing 2,000 lives or 500 lives in a hurricane much more devastating in its impact, we lost less than 100 lives.

Having said this, Mr. Chairman, much remains to be done. Fortunately, we learn from experience, even though the experience may be as gruesome as this one.

It has only been recently that Congress has authorized hurricane studies. There are many areas of the country similarly exposed, as is our own. Hurricanes are not limited to Louisiana. Hurricanes have hit every State on the gulf coast many times and every State in the Atlantic area and in the Northeast. One of the most devastating hit the area of the great State of Massachusetts—I see our Speaker sitting here—in the year 1938.

So, Mr. Chairman, this has been a matter of continuing and constant research. Fortunately, as a result of previous hurricanes, particularly the devastating 1947 hurricane, the Corps of Engineers, working in close collaboration with this distinguished committee of this Congress, has already perfected a hurricane protection plan for southeast Louisiana and that plan is incorporated in this omnibus rivers and harbors bill which we will be voting on hopefully today. It is a comprehensive plan. It is one that may have to be reviewed in light of the experience of 10 days ago, but it is the opinion of the Corps of Engineers that had the plan been in effect the damage from floodwaters would have been incalculably less than has been experienced.

As a matter of fact, we have examples to demonstrate that. In 1947 a heavily populated area in my own district, similar to the one that was flooded by Betsy in Mr. HÉBERT'S district, was flooded out. Fortunately, we had a special project. Whereas there was more water on that levee this time than last time, not one drop of water inundated the homes of these people in East Jefferson parish. This demonstrates better than any words I can utter the wisdom of the Congress in considering and adopting these flood control and other projects designed to conserve the resources of our country and to protect our people from disaster.

Mr. Chairman, I get considerably annoyed, as I am sure most of you do, when I read the trite and ill-considered expressions oftentimes by people who know little about what they are speaking, in which they describe this bill, for instance, as a "pork-barrell" bill, one that apparently they think has had little or no consideration. All of us know that each one of these projects is carefully reviewed by a whole host of Government agencies. Then we finally authorize, and after authorization we must go through the long, deliberate process of obtaining appropriations, where again these projects are reviewed. I do not know of a single project that has been approved in any part of our country since I have had the privilege of being here that has not added to the wealth of our Nation and returned twofold or tenfold what we spent.

This very project which will be built in southeast Louisiana, largely in the constituency of my colleague from the First District, has a 17-to-1 ratio. That means for every dollar spent by the National Government there will be $17 in benefits to the people who live in that area.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I am sure our distinguished majority whip knows I have consistently in my service here supported these projects. But I would like the Committee to know, as little traveling as I usually do, I did have an opportunity a few years ago of viewing in person the Hoover Dam. And, Mr. Chairman, I left that place determined that so long as I am a Member of this body I shall support such worthwhile projects.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Let me deal for a moment with a very important matter that my distinguished colleague from the First District of Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and the

distinguished gentleman from California, touched on, namely, where a hiatus exists in our disaster laws. We have done a remarkable job in disasters in this country, and the expedition with which every branch of the National Government, working in conjunction with our State government and our city and parish governments, came to the aid of Louisiana, is something I will be eternally grateful for, as I am sure all of the people of Louisiana will, and should be.

Let me characterize some of these areas of assistance. To begin with, the port of New Orleans is the second largest port in the United States. The amount of damage at that port is great. In the port many ships were damaged. Several were sunk. Two modern automated ships that were almost completed were sunk, and each one of them cost about $12 to $14 million. Many barges, very expensive barges, were grounded and sunk. Many of the facilities of the port were absolutely wrecked and many suffered great damage.

In a matter of a few hours, the Office of Emergency Planning was there. Under the disaster relief legislation, most of those facilities can be rebuilt under programs that the Congress has approved. In addition, public schools, public installations, sewerage installations, drainage, water works and public buildings are all eligible for direct grants.

So you get down to two areas and I am sure they are the areas that need help probably most of all. No. 1 is the individual homeowner whose home was flooded and who is unable to purchase commercially or from the Government any type of flood insurance because no such thing exists because the risks are so high. This, of course, is what the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from California were referring to.

The other is with reference to the farmer, particularly the small farmer who carries a tremendous burden. Even the aid which is now available through the SBA and through other agencies of Government, unfortunately is limited so far as farmers are concerned. So I would hope that this terrible disaster that affected not only my State, but other States as well, and the disaster which occurred in California in the latter part of last year and other disasters that have occurred would not only teach us the great benefit and value of this legislation that we are considering today, but also will be the vehicle through which we can fill the last remaining gaps in the disaster programs of our National Government.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate and commend this committee on the fine and outstanding job they have done in reporting this legislation to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, this rivers and harbors bill which we are considering today has a special meaning for me. Its importance for the safety of more of our citizens is all the more poignant in view of what I have seen in recent days. I refer to the devastation brought to my State of Louisiana by Hurricane Betsy.

Several of my colleagues in the Louisiana delegation and I accompanied President Johnson to my State the day that Hurricane Betsy struck south Louisiana. The President had a firsthand look at the human misery and the destruction caused by this monster storm. He pledged the full resources of the Federal Government to bring all manner of aid to the victims of Betsy.

I spent that same weekend touring the Metropolitan New Orleans area and the parishes in my district. What I saw was awesome, and terrifying. Death, destruction, anguish—all were there. One-hundred and twenty-five-mile-an-hour winds whipped tidal waves of more than 7 feet over and through the Mississippi-to-gulf tidewater channel; the industrial canal and over and through back levees in the area. After this nightmare, I also saw the courage and determination of the people of New Orleans and of south Louisiana to rebuild, and to do so as quickly as possible. I was particularly heartened by the efficiency and dispatch with which the President mobilized the agencies of the National Government to bring broad assistance and relief to the people of my State. The cooperation between all levels of government to ease the suffering, to clear the debris, to begin to rebuild was, and is, stirring. Man's humanity to man has been displayed countless times in the wake of this terrible hurricane. It has been done in the spirit of Christianity and brotherly love. Gov. John J. McKeithen opened his home in Baton Rouge—the Governor's mansion—to families made homeless by the ravages of this storm.

Mr. Chairman, Hurricane Betsy certainly was the most devastating hurricane to strike southeast Louisiana in this century, and probably the worst one, in terms of total property damage in the entire history of my State.

I daresay all of us in this House would much prefer that preventative measures, such as the navigation and flood control projects in this bill, were perfect, were fool-proof, so as to prevent the loss of life, the injuries and destruction of property which occurred in Louisiana, or has occurred in other States. Of course, it is impossible that our preventative measures against major disasters will be perfect. But through our skills, we can improve them, we can make them superior and more extensive than they are now. That is the purpose of this authorization bill. That is the reason members of the Public Works Committee and the Corps of Engineers have worked closely together to give to our people of this great Nation more extensive and superior protective projects.

In the United States, Mr. Chairman, we have achieved more than any other nation in controlling and harnessing to our good use the great rivers, streams, lakes and other bodies of water in our country. Through the ingenuity and foresight of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the wisdom of Congress, we have approved and constructed many navigation and flood control projects across this land. We have done so, not only to control the destructive force of some of our bodies of water, but also—and more importantly—to improve them to our good use. We have built deeper channels to increase commerce and improve navigation on our waterways.

We have built harbors; we have provided, through locks and levees, through damming up and through opening or diverting waterways, the means for increasing commerce by inland boats and ocean-going vessels. We have accomplished much in this field to strengthen our country and enhance its progress and prosperity.

Navigation and flood control projects—their construction and maintenance—are absolutely necessary for the growth and development of the United States, Mr. Chairman. This is a good bill; this is a most worthy bill, and I am confident that the House, in its wisdom, will approve the projects included in it.

In light of the havoc caused by Hurricane Betsy to south Louisiana and to Florida and other areas, I should like to cite one existing project of the Army Engineers in the Lake Pontchartrain area. I am very proud of the success of this project. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the protection levee, built by the Army Engineers after the terrific hurricane of 1947, to keep east Jefferson Parish free of lake waters in any hurricane. This levee has been erected along the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain from the Orleans-Jefferson line to St. Charles Parish, and it has proved to be remarkably effective.

The central force of the 1947 hurricane included the New Orleans area, and I lost an aunt in that terrible storm. But the destructive swath of the hurricane included the New Orleans area, and I know firsthand what devastation that storm brought. I was a young Congressman then; and the impact of what I saw has remained with me very vividly. It was rekindled by the horrors of Betsy.

The 1947 hurricane dumped tons of water on east Jefferson Parish, up to a depth of 8 feet and as far back as two and a half miles from the lake. Some 39 square miles in Metairie and in the rest of east Jefferson were inundated. Some $4 million in property damage was suffered by the people of east Jefferson alone; and the total property loss in the Metropolitan New Orleans area was more than $6.5 million.

After the 1947 hurricane, I was determined to do everything I could to provide floodwater protection for the people of east Jefferson Parish. By working with Senators ALLEN ELLENDER and RUSSELL LONG of Louisiana, we obtained authorization for construction of a protection levee there. And we have worked to obtain on a regular basis the necessary funds to build and to maintain this protection levee. Today this levee is more than 80 percent complete. This strong barrier has kept Lake Pontchartrain waters out of east Jefferson in the hurricanes of 1956, Flossie; 1964, Hilda; and again with Betsy this year. The effectiveness of this levee is full proof of what can be done. The value of this levee emphasizes the need for a larger, more extensive hurricane barrier all along the south shore of the lake and part of the north shore, so as to protect the citizens of Orleans, Jefferson, St. Bernard, St. Charles, and other

parishes; and to provide greater protection in the area below New Orleans in St. Bernard and Plaquemines Parishes.

As Members of the House know, the total property damage to public and private property in Louisiana alone—not to mention Florida, Mississippi, Alabama—will exceed $1 billion, according to an estimate by Governor McKeithen. In 7 major hurricanes to hit southeast Louisiana since 1900, some 800 people have lost their lives. The terrible hurricane of 1893 brought death to some 2,000 people.

One of the projects in this bill—the Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity project—is designed to provide the metropolitan New Orleans area and southeast Louisiana with more extensive, stronger hurricane and flood protection. The project calls for the erection of a huge hurricane barrier wall along the south shore of the lake, and on part of the north shore; and the construction of new levees, or the improvement of existing ones, in the Mississippi River area east of New Orleans and below the city. The approval of this project will reduce greatly the dangers of flooding, particularly in New Orleans itself, which came in Betsy's wake.

In brief, the Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity project will provide:

First. A full levee and floodwall barrier along the south shore of the lake, together with repair and reinforcement of the existing seawall at Mandeville on the north shore;

Second. That this huge barrier include a navigation gate and flood gates in the Chef Menteur Pass to the east of New Orleans; a lock and flood gates in the Rigolets Pass to the east of New Orleans; and a multiple-purpose lock at the lakeward end of the inner harbor navigation canal;

Third. A levee and a floodwall barrier along the southeast side of the area to prevent tidal surges from Lake Borgne into Lake Pontchartrain;

Fourth. For the Chalmette area, a total of about 17.3 miles of new and enlarged levees, extending generally along the southerly banks of the gulf intracoastal waterway and the Mississippi-to-Gulf outlet to Bayou Dupre and thence westerly to the Mississippi River levee at Violet;

Fifth. A lock in the inner harbor navigation canal near Seabrook to prevent water velocities hazardous to navigation in the canal, and the increased salinity in Lake Pontchartrain; both this Seabrook lock and the levee for the intracoastal waterway and the Mississippi River tidewater channel would help control tidal surges into the lake and also augment the hurricane barrier across Pontchartrain's south shore.

I do not pretend to say, Mr. Chairman, that this project to protect southeast Louisiana from hurricane flood waters is perfect. But I am confident it will accomplish much to prevent loss of life and property destruction.

For one thing, my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Congressman ROBERT JONES, who is chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, and is a recognized authority in this field, pointed out in the committee report on this rivers and harbors bill that the ratio of benefit to cost for the Lake Pontchartrain project is $17 for every $1 spent to build it and maintain it.

This is one of the highest benefit-to-cost ratios ever estimated for any flood control project presented to the Public Works Committee, according to Congressman JONES. The cost of this worthy project will be about $84.8 million—with the National Government providing about 70 percent of the total of about $56.9 million, and the parishes in south Louisiana involved providing about $27.9 million.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and other members of the Public Works Committee, have agreed, Mr. Chairman, to take a firsthand look at the destruction wrought by Betsy in south Louisiana this weekend; and to take testimony on the total property damage in Louisiana, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi from public and private officials. My colleagues, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. WILLIS, and I will accompany Mr. JONES and other members of the Public Works Committee, including Mr. GRAY, of Illinois, Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER, of Iowa, and Mr. SWEENEY, of Ohio. There may be other members who will join us, Mr. Chairman, on this important mission.

We will conduct a hearing on Saturday in New Orleans, and on Sunday in Baton Rouge, the State capital city. We will hear testimony on total property damage with two principal views in mind:

First. To ascertain whether it is desirable to recommend to the Congress that special legislation be enacted immediately to provide extra financial assistance and relief to the victims of hurricane Betsy in all four States; such financial aid would augment and supplement that now being provided by President Johnson through his Emergency Disaster Relief Fund; and

Second. To determine whether a recommendation should be made to the Army Corps of Engineers that the Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity project should be reviewed with the thought that as its construction is progressing, the project would be expanded, modified and improved to give more extensive hurricane and flood protection to the people of southeast Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. JONES' committee has the authority to do these things; and I and my colleagues from Louisiana and I dare say all the people of my State, are most grateful to Mr. JONES for his generosity and his thoughtfulness in agreeing to go to Louisiana and conduct these hearings. We will be most appreciative for his advice and counsel in this matter, once he has made an on-site inspection of the devastated areas and heard the testimony of public and private officials. I am confident that the result of this inspection trip and these hearings will be most fruitful, and will bring both added help to Betsy's victims and greater hurricane protection for southeast Louisiana.

I am pleased to report also, Mr. Chairman, that the House is receiving for this important mission the full and complete cooperation of some 10 or 11 Federal agencies which have been directly engaged in bringing assistance and relief to the victims of Betsy. Representatives of these agencies and departments will join us in journeying to Louisiana for the inspection and the hearings. Some of them will testify, along with their field officers who have been stationed in Louisiana since Betsy struck. Those agencies to be represented by high-ranking officers include: the Department of Agriculture; the Bureau of Public Roads; the Economic Development Administration—arm of the Commerce Department; Housing and Home Finance Administration; the Army Corps of Engineers; the Maritime Administration; the Small Business Administration; the Red Cross; the U.S. Public Health Service; the Office of Emergency Planning, and maybe others. I know they will give to the Congress and the people of Louisiana and the other States involved the best of their advice and counsel, and the maximum in the form of assistance and relief—something they have been doing in a magnificent way since Hurricane Betsy hit south Louisiana on September 10 and 11. I am proud and pleased that representatives of these fine agencies are going to join in this worthy undertaking for the benefit of Louisiana, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi.

I frankly think that in the design stages of this project, when construction planning is being refined through funds to be provided by the appropriations committees of the House and the Senate, there should be an extensive review of the project, keeping in mind the erratic course of Hurricane Betsy and the ravages of that hurricane. I think it would be constructive if the Army Corps of Engineers, as they have done in the past, could review this project, with a view toward expanding it or modifying it. If they find, in their wisdom, that this hurricane barrier plan, as proposed in this bill, is not adequate, is not as good as it should be, then I am confident that the Engineers will work diligently to improve the project. There is no doubt that Hurricane Betsy points up the need, too, of accelerated action to begin the construction of this sweeping barrier plan for the Metropolitan New Orleans area. I am confident that in this session of Congress, the first planning funds for this project will be appropriated; my colleagues and I from Louisiana are working toward that end.

I am also pleased to insert into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a fine front-page story from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La., in the issue of this past Sunday, September 19, 1965. The article was written by Mr. Clarence Doucet, and in it, he provides a clear word picture of the status of the Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity project, and what this fine project includes. Mr. Doucet's article follows:

HURRICANE PLAN 2 YEARS OLD; MIGHT HAVE CUT OFF FLOODS—$56.9 MILLION IN BILL COMING BEFORE HOUSE

(By Clarence Doucet)

Already 2 years old is a recommended hurricane plan by the U.S. Corps of Engineers,

which, had it been carried out before Betsy, might have prevented disastrous flooding.

Federal funds for the plan, costing $84.6 million, are included in the omnibus bill on rivers, harbors, and flood control which the House will consider this week.

Prof. Chester A. Peyronnin, Jr., Tulane University engineer and specialist on hurricane damages, served as a consultant to the U.S. Engineers on the hurricane protection plan design.

He says completion of the study was delayed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission who required assurance that any plan would not adversely affect the fish life in Lake Pontchartrain.

OUTLOOK GOOD—BOGGS

United States Representative HALE BOGGS has said the outlook is good for obtaining the first appropriations from Congress this year to begin planning the construction of the hurricane barrier project.

Getting the Federal funds is only part of the problem.

The Federal Government agrees to pay about 70 percent of the cost, or $56.9 million. Those funds are in the bill before the House.

The remaining $27.9 million must be put up by the State and the parishes.

Even after the money became available, it would take about 10 years to fully implement the plan.

DESIGN FOR PROTECTION

The plan is designed to protect the New Orleans area against a "design" storm, the type officials say comes only once in a century.

Two years ago when the plan was announced, a newspaper headline warned: "Hurricane Could Flood Most of New Orleans."

It was pointed out in the report that in the case of a "design" storm that Chalmette would be under at least 10 feet of water, and that water would be over the tops of automobiles.

The problem of how to deal with a "design" storm, or her real-life counterpart is solved, according to the report, by a system of gates and control structures to keep water out of Lake Pontchartrain as well as a string of high levees to protect the remainder of the area which would be threatened by water by any of the various inland waterways.

CONFIDENCE OF WORTH

Professor Peyronnin, Jr., is confident that had the hurricane plan been completed before Betsy, flooded areas at the most would have experienced "a little spill" that would have caused water in the street, but little more.

He further asserts that construction of the levees which would have prevented much of Betty's damage could be done in 2 to 3 years.

While there was not time to prevent Betsy from causing damage, speedy action by Congress and State and parish governments can lend some insurance against future storms leaving the area as devastated.

The Engineers call their creation Standard Project Hurricane, and to it they have added the course they believe would be most dangerous to the city. It is a course several miles east of the 1915 hurricane.

BARRIER PROPOSED

Recommended is a barrier to keep hurricanes from forcing more water into Lake Pontchartrain than the lake can handle. This would cost about $65 million, or about the same amount it cost to build the Greater New Orleans Mississippi River Bridge.

The plan calls for control structures where Lake Borgne flows into Lake Pontchartrain at Chef Menteur Pass and the Rigolets.

The engineers discarded the possibility of increasing the height of levees on the Lake Pontchartrain lakefront because they would have to be so high to withstand a 12-foot tidal surge.

This is what the plan would do:

The Rigolets: Where Highway 90 crosses this major opening from the gulf to Lake Pontchartrain a concrete control structure, earthen dam and navigation lock would be constructed.

The 1,450-foot control structure with 23 huge vertical lift steel gates to permit or shut off tidal flow would be on the New Orleans side of the channel.

LOCK 84 FEET WIDE

The lock, 84 feet wide by 800 feet long would be open continually to pleasure craft, commercial vessels and tows except under abnormal tide conditions and would be on the other side of the channel.

The open water between the two would be blocked off with an earthen dam.

Chef Menteur Pass: The Chef Menteur would be closed off with a dam where it meets Bayou Sauvage. The bayou would have a dam across it.

Navigation channels, 12 by 100 feet, would be dug to allow entry to the lake from both the bayou and the Chef. A floodgate would allow free flow of tidal waters except in emergency situations.

Chef to Rigolets Dike Levees: A 9-foot levee would run from the Rigolets to Chef Menteur and from the Chef Menteur to a present New Orleans East levee.

The levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and its link to Highway 90 would be enlarged and the Industrial Canal levees raised about 3½ feet.

A new levee would go up along the lakeshore between the Bonnet Carre Spillway and the St. Charles-Jefferson Parish line, with a lateral levee along the parish line itself.

Existing levees along the New Orleans lakefront would be raised 2 feet. East of the Industrial Canal, a new 11-foot-high levee would be constructed all the way to South Point (South Shore).

NEW 16-FOOT LEVEE

A new 16-foot levee would be constructed for more than 13 miles along the south bank of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet to Bayou Dupre and then along the bayou to Violet. (This is the back edge of the protective ring that would be provided for Chalmette and other St. Bernard areas.) No levee exists at present, although the report indicates a 6-foot-high spoils bank.

Industrial Canal: The engineers think it is important to construct a navigation lock where the canal meets the lake to prevent hurricane surges from entering the lake through the gulf outlet, which joins the canal.

The project would be funded under present gulf outlet authorizations.

North Shore: A concrete wall and strengthened seawall would be built at Mandeville, where considerable flooding would take place if Standard Project Hurricane hit.

Standard Project Hurricane is given a specific course. It approaches New Orleans from the south, crossing the coastline west of the Mississippi River mouth and curves northeastward over Lake Borgne.

PREVENTION POSSIBLE

Peyronnin says the Betsy flooding could have been prevented by this plan via the higher levees along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and around Chalmette which would have either prevented or minimized the overlap of floodwater in those areas.

The proposed control structures where Lake Borgne flows into Lake Pontchartrain and the Industrial Canal could have kept the surplus water confined to Borgne.

He also said Pointe a la Hache on the east bank and Port Sulphur, Empire, Buras, and Venice on the west bank would have been afforded considerable protection by the recommended improvements.

In those areas, he says, there would not have been flooding of any consequence. The reason is that present 8-foot levees would have been raised to 13.5 feet from Empire to Venice. Pointe a la Hache and Port Sulphur.

WOULD HALT TIDES

The raised levees along the Industrial Canal, Intracoastal Waterway and Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet would take care of rising tides which might move from Lake Borgne, he said.

No floodgates or locks are proposed for the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet.

As far as the possibility of flooding through wharf structures on the Industrial Canal, a dock board spokesman said the wharves are built 2 feet above the highest known water level.

Peyronnin said new boats slips built along the outer waterways will be sealed in some way and this is being studied.

UNITED FUND STORM AID PANEL FORMED

A special committee has been organized by the New Orleans United Fund to receive and process donations for aid of disaster victims, announced United Fund president, Francis Doyle.

J. Mason Webster of Tulane University is director of a committee established in response to many inquiries from individuals and corporations who want to provide emergency funds.

Webster said his committee will receive and process funds, including those designated for special agencies. The United Fund has the machinery to see that those agencies which urgently need additional funds will receive them from contributors, he said.

The Fund recently announced that neither it nor any of its member agencies would conduct a special campaign. Individuals and firms served by the Fund will be asked to give a "plus gift."

Webster said funds being received locally to support the work of 60 agencies including the Red Cross and Salvation Army are in excess of $3.873 million.

Serving on the Special United Fund Disaster Committee with Webster are Willis Penny, Dr. Leonard L. Burns, Robert E. Develle, Mrs. L. D. Hall, and Wilmer G. Hinrichs.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require to comment briefly on the remarks made by the gentleman from Louisiana, and others and also the rights and responsibility of our committee in this area.

I am sure many Members of this body recall that when we had the education committee disaster relief bill that gives special treatment to the educational facilities including replacement of textbooks and maintenance, I raised the question: If you are going to do it relating to schools, why not consider giving treatment that is needed proper and judicious consideration to what should be done in all respects regarding disaster relief?

Now it is clear and it is true that in every instance of a disaster, I think our committee has accepted full responsibility and gone into the area. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that our committee for the first time in my memory, thanks to the good chairmanship of the gentleman from Maryland, has gone into each disaster area, and the committee itself has inspected the damage and has indicated properly an interest in the matter and has tried to come up with some solutions regarding the

need under existing law to provide additional authorizations for funds. But we are faced with the basic problem today and tomorrow thta the gentleman from Louisiana raised and that is: what do you do with regard to areas not covered under present law relating to private homes and other public facilities for which under the present law only repair and returning to the previous condition of those public facilities is permitted? That is an issue in my opinion that this Congress has to face up to. I would suggest respectfully to our committee that now is not too late to act. I would suggest to the Committee on Public Works and to the Members present on the floor of the House that what we should do is that the chairman of the committee should appoint an ad hoc committee to act during the recess, if they ever let us recess around here, to study the basic laws relating to national and natural disasters to determine what our committee action should be in the coming sessions of Congress. We have to face up to this problem. We cannot put it off. I say in addition to that, of course, we have on the books today, and it was written a number of years ago, but never implemented, a national insurance program for natural disasters and hurricane insurance.

That has never been implemented. Why should not consideration be given to that program? I think our committee ought to get into this field now and study the basic law of those questions.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina such time as he may consume.

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to commend each member of the great Committee on Public Works, particularly the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, for their foresight, good judgment and their dedicated concern for the resources of the Nation, and the well-being of our people, in reporting to the House for our consideration here today this bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, for recreation, and for other economic purposes.

A total of 144 individual projects is included in the bill at a total estimated Federal cost of $1,970 million. The projects are located in 41 States, spreading their benefits to many millions of our people.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I am especially interested in the authorization, through this legislation, of the development of the Neuse River Basin in the great State of North Carolina.

This bill authorizes improvements in the Neuse Basin down to Pamlico Sound involving Federal expenditures totaling $29 million—$18,600,000 for the Falls Dam and Reservoir and $10,400,000 for the project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity.

Mr. Chairman, the development of the Neuse River Basin will bring untold benefits to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of North Carolina, which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, and to our State generally; and the economic stimulation will be felt over a wide area beyond the bounds of North Carolina.

This development is especially beneficial to the city of Raleigh, the capital of the State of North Carolina.

The rapidly growing capital city has an immediate and pressing need for an adequate supply of water for municipal and industrial uses. At present Raleigh gets its water from several reservoirs on the smaller creeks. The safe yield of the present source will soon be exceeded. The Falls Reservoir will store 45,000-acre-feet of water for this purpose. This will provide for Raleigh's needs for years to come. The 45,000-acre-feet of storage will provide Raleigh with about 100 million gallons of water per day.

The Neuse River Basin, situated in the eastern part of North Carolina, is approximately 180 miles long, with a maximum width of 46 miles. The Neuse is formed by the confluence of the Eno and Flat Rivers, about 8 miles north of the city of Durham, and has a drainage area of approximately 5,700 square miles.

The only existing flood control project of a permanent nature constructed on the Neuse by the Corps of Engineers is the cutoff at Goldsboro. This project consists of a flood channel across two adjoining bends of the river.

Major floods occur in the Neuse River Basin as a result of heavy rainfall from thunderstorms, hurricanes, and tropical storms. Such damage, according to the Corps of Engineers, averages about $1,256,000 annually.

The recommended plan of improvement of the basin is for construction of the Falls Dam and Reservoir in the interest of flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation and for other purposes, and the recommendations include a general plan of improvement embracing 12 other reservoirs as a guide for future development of the water and related land resources of the basin.

The authorization in the bill before us today is for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, $18,600,000, and for the project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity, $10,400,000.

At New Bern the Neuse River widens into a broad tidal estuary that empties into Pamlico Sound. Any sustained strong winds from the northeast quadrant on Pamlico Sound cause increased water levels in the Neuse estuary with frequent damaging results to urban and other developed areas. This legislation authorizes construction of a hurricane-tidal barrier at the Cherry Point-Wilkinson Point site on the Neuse, to include an ungated navigation opening.

Mr. Chairman, I note particularly the statements of the committee with respect to the authorizations on the Neuse, as follows:

Falls Dam and Reservoir: The committee recognizes the desirability of protecting the flood plains of the Neuse River from disastrous flood damage. The Falls Dam and Reservoir project would be an effective initial step in controlling floods and providing needed water supply, water quality control, and recreation in the basin.

New Bern and vicinity: The committee considers this project to be needed for hurricane protection at New Bern. However, the committee notes that economic justification is dependent on realization of benefits which, in turn, are dependent in considerable part on actions by local interest in regard to bridge construction and recreational use of the hurricane barrier slope. Accordingly, the committee considers it desirable that these benefits be reviewed carefully in connection with the evaluation studies normally made during preconstruction planning, taking into account the intentions of local interests at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the Falls Dam and Reservoir is a first step in the development of the land and water resources of the Neuse River Basin. The Corps of Engineers' report describes 12 additional potential reservoir projects in the basin which are to be studied in the future.

I would also point out that the local people in the Neuse River Basin are taking steps to solve some of the existing land and water problems. The Department of Agriculture has received nine applications for assistance under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended. Watershed work plans developed by these local organizations with assistance from the Department of Agriculture have been approved for five of these watersheds and assistance is being provided for the installation of improvements. The Department of Agriculture is now providing technical assistance to local organizations in developing a watershed work plan for a sixth watershed in the basin.

Other local organizations have also indicated an interest in developing watershed work plans and installing improvement measures in other watersheds in the basin.

I am greatly interested in seeing that the land and water resources of the Neuse Riven Basin are developed to their maximum potential. I hope that future studies in the basin will be carried out jointly by the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Engineers in cooperation with State and local agencies. I am sure such studies will determine the most appropriate manner of providing for the development of the basin's resources through combinations of watershed projects under the provisions of Public Law 566 and additional reservoir projects as are considered in the Chief of Engineers' report.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure the House that our people living in the basin are ready and willing to do their part in the Neuse River Basin development.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Florida for again pointing out, as he usually does, with his great skill, the overwhelming need to meet this particular disaster problem.

As the gentleman knows, in 1956 a disaster act was passed, but it has never been implemented.

I shall ask to include in the RECORD at this point a recommendation I have made to the committee in support of a study in depth on the problem of inadequate disaster insurance. I would like to work with the committee, and I hope that my recommendations will be followed.

The attached news release from my office on July 14, 1965, spells out guidelines for the development of an adequate natural disaster insurance program. This could be of value to the Members similarly concerned:

NEWS RELEASE

Congressman DON H. CLAUSEN today charged that a program of adequate aid to private individuals whose property is damaged in floods and other natural disasters "simply does not exist."

In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Small Business, CLAUSEN said such a program is critically needed.

"It is to this end that I ask the Congress to direct its greatest efforts and talents," he said.

CLAUSEN said, "The millions of dollars spent by the Federal Government, the States, the Red Cross, Salvation Army, church relief, and the many great voluntary organizations, though sincerely appreciated, can by no means begin to provide relief for the mental anguish and personal losses suffered by those immediately affected."

The First District Congressman said that the National Disaster Act of 1956 takes care of political subdivisions and the public sector generally, "but the program to sufficiently handle the private sector problems simply does not exist."

The subcommittee, an arm of the House Banking and Currency Committee, held hearings last week on a series of bills calling for detailed studies of flood aid to individuals. It was hoped that such studies, one of which was proposed by CLAUSEN, would lead to national disaster insurance which individuals could afford and would cover their losses in time of disaster.

The subcommittee today released testimony received during its hearings.

"We need a program that can be triggered into action as soon after the disaster occurs as is physically and administratively possible," CLAUSEN said.

CLAUSEN said he believed any study proposed by Congress should proceed in the following general direction:

Ask the insurance industry to advise the Congress whether it can or cannot specifically provide adequate insurance underwriting to meet the problem, either by individual companies, through re-insurance or risk-pooling concepts?

If not, can an arrangement similar to the FHA underwriting Government industry cooperative agreement be developed?

Is a subsidy arrangement, containing adequately defined insurable limits a possibility—providing the administration of the program supplements and does not conflict with reasonable insurance program objectives?

The Red Cross, Salvation Army, Office of Emergency Planning, churches of all denominations and the many voluntary relief agencies should be asked to provide advice and counsel to the agency conducting the study, thereby providing the Congress with the invaluable benefits gained through years of disaster relief experience.

Adequate flood plain zoning must be an integral part of the program until such time as adequate flood protective works can be built.

Mr. CRAMER. This is one of the areas which such an ad hoc committee could study and come up with recommendations with regard to disaster relief in all of these areas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the session I introduced a bill requesting the Congress to establish such a commission and study the whole problem of disaster insurance and the relationship of the Federal Government, State governments, and local governments, with the insurance industry. Some months later the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] filed a bill identical to mine. Such a bill has passed the Senate. The measure was on our calendar a week ago Monday, the day on which we had 22 quorum and rollcalls. I believe it is known as Senate 408. If there is any possibility of taking that bill up this session, that proposal would be available for us to approach this serious and timely subject.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. That is another indication of the importance of the subject to many Members of the Congress. It is obviously urgent as a result of the floods that have taken place and the damage which has resulted throughout much of the South, including Florida and Louisiana, as examples.

Mr. Charman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] 7 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take up the time of my colleagues in debate on the floor of the House in relation to a bill which does not come from a committee of which I am a member. But I think it is necessary to do so because one of the projects in the bill directly affects both the responsibility and the position of a committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Appropriations.

The project involved that requires the attention of all of us who serve as Members of the House, and the manner in which that project appears in the bill, is the Trinity River project in Texas.

As I understand it, that is a project which approaches $1 billion in its scope. We are talking about the authorization of two parts of that project. The parts are quite similar in the amount of money involved. One-half billion dollars relates to water conservation, recreation, and flood control. That part, as I understand it, has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The other part, another one-half billion dollars, relates to navigation, a 12-foot canal, 150 feet wide, running for 300 or 400 miles across the State of Texas.

That part, as I also understand, does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has said that that part ought to be restudied and ought to be reevaluated, and the criteria upon which that reevaluation is made should be in terms of having it brought up to date before it ought to be considered for authorization. That part, as I also understand it, has a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than unity on the basis of the figures which have been set forth by the Bureau of the Budget.

On page 85 appears an authorization for this $1 billion project of only $83 million.

But the language specifically says "including navigation." In other words, we are asked to partially authorize the part which has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the part which, under existing criteria, has a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than unity.

Earlier today, if I recall correctly—and perhaps some corrections will be made by members of the committee—the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] referred to 12 new projects which have been sent up since this bill was reported, and earlier in the general debate someone referred to another project, I believe the gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman in charge of floor debate suggested that there would probably be another omnibus bill next year.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee and particularly of the Subcommittee on Public Works, which has cognizance over the funding of projects of this kind, I cannot help being concerned over the manner in which this is being handled. This is a piecemeal authorization of a huge project, part of which does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and which has a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than 1. I cannot help being concerned over the argument that we should authorize a part of it now so that the highway officials in the State of Texas will know that they can go ahead on the basis of it.

In other words, the foot will be in the door and every member of this committee will be considered as being committed, and the Appropriations Committee will be considered as being committed for not the $83 million which appears in this bill but for the billion dollars we are talking about for this project.

The Bureau of the Budget has said that there can be a restudy and a reevaluation within a period of 6 months. If that is true, I believe this Congress owes it to itself and the Members of the House owe to the integrity of our Appropriations Committee to await the results of that kind of a restudy and reevaluation. If it can be done in 6 months, as the Bureau of the Budget says, the results of that restudy will be before the second session of the 89th Congress so that, if there is an omnibus bill, as twice has been indicated today, it could be included as an authorization at that time.

It appears to me that we can do great harm to the confidence of the American people. We can do great harm to the confidence of the people in us and great harm to the confidence of the Members of the House and of the American people in the Committee on Public Works, the authorizing committee, if we proceed with this kind of a piecemeal authorization, in the light of the questions

which have been raised both in the executive and legislative branches.

If I am wrong in these figures or if I am wrong in asserting that the Bureau of the Budget has said this ought to be reevaluated and restudied and that they do not approve of authorizing it at this time, we should have some clarification now. If I am correct, I believe this project ought to be deferred until the omnibus bill for next year.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend the gentleman on his position. He is taking the same position that I took before the committee. I raised the same points he has raised and the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Army raised. I offered an amendment to strike the navigational features from that portion of the authorization, setting forth the same objections and the same reasons the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has stated.

However, we were not successful in that effort. We did achieve an element of success. We had written into the authorization a provision for a restudy. We further obtained a concession that up-to-date or present criteria would be used in the restudy, including an adequate rate of interest together with the usual 50-year amortization or lifetime period.

In addition to that, the authorization, while it does in effect give blanket authorization to the entire project, only gives a monetary authorizaation in the sum of $83 million. That means the committee and the Congress will have to come back and take another look at this project after the restudy and before further monetary authorizations are made. So, while we did not accomplish the purposes set forth and overcome the objections raised by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Army, we did in great measure strengthen the original proposal. We did accomplish that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio feels at least in the eyes of the people from the State of Texas that Congress is not committed and the hands of the members of the Committee on Appropriations are tied as far as being sure that we get the kind of a restudy and reevaluation we are talking about.

Mr. HARSHA. I think we will certainly get a restudy and certainly the legislative history is clear enough so that we will get a restudy based on current criteria. I am not fooling you or anybody else. We have authorized the project.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, let me set the record straight.

One of the really impressive things about this Trinity River program is the number of Americans it will serve.

The amount of money involved would not be considered too great when representing a total package for the development of the waters over the next 15 or 20 years in an entire State of our Union.

And yet, the Trinity River Basin, for which this project will do just that, contains more people than any one of 32 States in our Nation. The people who will benefit by this project amount to more than 3 percent of the Nation's total population.

Certainly we are not doing too much for them by comparison to projects for the rest of the country in development of water resources.

According to the projection made before our committee by Maj. Gen. Jackson Graham, the Chief of Engineers for Civil Works if we assume that this project could be completed in 10 annual installments, we would be devoting approximately 2 percent of the Federal expenditures on water resources development. And yet this amount would be serving more than 3 percent of the population.

Today the Forth Worth and Dallas metropolitan area is the largest single concentration of people anywhere in the country not served by a navigable waterway.

So, as a matter of justice and fairness, it seems to me that this project is amply justified on the basis of the great part of Americans that it will serve and by the careful planning and cooperation which has gone into it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the interest expressed by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], but there are certain factual inaccuracies contained in his summation of the Trinity River project.

It is not, as he indicated, a "billion-dollar project." At least it does not involve $1 billion in Federal expenditures. The only way we could refer to it accurately as a billion-dollar project would be by taking into account all of the moneys which have been expended and pledged by State and local and private sources to the completion of this vital program.

The best estimate available on the total Federal cost of the entire comprehensive program is approximately $737 million. This would extend over a period of at least 10 years in the completion of 14 flood control and multiple-purpose projects, as well as the navigation canal. The U.S. Corps of Engineers' estimate of $515 million for the navigation canal includes a 25-percent contingency fund safety factor which has been added to the cost estimates.

No comprehensive program of this type that has ever come before the Congress has enjoyed such a magnificent degree of willing local financial participation. More than $500 million in totally non-Federal funds either have been spent or will be spent on this total development program.

Our entire committee, I am sure, was greatly impressed by the intelligence and spirit of the large delegation from Texas which appeared before us in behalf of this Trinity River project.

It was the largest group to come before the committee in behalf of any program we had under consideration. The testimony given by the group was factual and intelligent and extremely well presented.

But the main thing this delegation demonstrated was the complete unanimity of support, public and private, for this project. There were in that group 62 mayors and 15 county judges, as well as the civic and industrial leaders of Texas.

They filed with the committee copies of official resolutions adopted by the local governing bodies pledging their local financial and moral cooperation in every phase of this activity.

The people living in the Trinity River Basin have indeed put their money where their mouth is. They already have spent $269 million of local money in the development of this river basin and have pledged additional amounts totaling $256 million more.

In other words, the local non-Federal interests, are putting up a total of more than half a billion dollars to match the Federal Government's work in connection with this project. They have completely demonstrated their good faith.

On the basis of this factor alone, it seems to me that this project deserves our support.

The committee very carefully considerd the Trinity River project and determined that it is fully justified on the basis of a realistic benefits-cost ratio.

The economic justification of the project was quite evident to those of us who listened attentively to the testimony.

We in the committee feel that the Corps of Engineers projection of the usage of the navigation canal is extremely conservative and that it actually will produce an enormous volume of shipping, a great deal more, in fact, than would be necessary to produce a favorable benefits-cost ratio.

The history of the traffic projections by the Corps of Engineers would seem to bear this out.

On the upper Mississippi, the Engineers projected anticipated tonnage of only 9 million tons. By 1963, the actual tonnage had reached 31 million, or 344 percent of the anticipated volume.

On the Illinois Waterway, the official projection was for only 7.5 million tons. Actually, tonnage in 1963 was 23.6 million—three times as much.

The Ohio River, estimated by the Corps of Engineers at 9 million tons annually, reached 88 million tons in 1963, or 973 percent of the estimate.

More in point, the Gulf Intra-Coastal Canal between New Orleans and Corpus Christi exceeded the 7-million-ton estimate by seven times, reaching approximately 50 million tons in 1963.

This Trinity Canal will connect with the Gulf Intra-Coastal Canal. The Bureau of the Budget stated that it was greatly impressed by the growth of the area. The canal will bring still greater industrialization and growth, and will pay for itself several times over.

The Bureau of the Budget made what the committee regarded as a most significant statement, when it said:

> More recent information on the growth of industry and freight traffic in the area suggests significant changes in the benefits originally assigned to the project. We have been impressed by the industrial growth in this region which has occurred since 1958.

As set forth in this bill, there are ample safeguards and continuing opportunities for congressional review, as explained by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA]. It is quite true that we are authorizing the project exactly as recommended by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

On any project of this scope and duration, however, the requirement of appropriations to carry out the work gives to Congress a continuing review.

The Public Works Committee, after carefully considering all sides and hearing all testimony in connection with the Trinity River project, has decided clearly that it is economically justified.

The divsion engineer assigned to it a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.6 to 1. The Chief of Engineers recommended the project. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors also recommended the project.

It has been further recommended by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and in all by a total of 18 official State and Federal agencies of government.

Interestingly, these recommendations were based on very low tonnage projections for shipments of grain and other commodities by way of the navigation canal.

The basic year used in the Corps of Engineers study was 1958—the last year of a scorching 7-year drought in the Southwest. Obviously, the amount of grain being grown in that year was far below normal.

Yet, even so, the figures came out favorably.

The records show that the actual shipment of grain today which would go by the waterway is already more than three times as much as was anticipated by this time in the use of the 1958 figures which formed the basis of the favorable report of the study.

To put it another way, shipments available for the barge canal are already greater than the Corps of Engineers projection anticipated for the year 2010.

The committee has on file affidavits from commercial shippers who state the volumes available which they would ship by the canal if it were complete now. In some cases these totals amount to 10 times as much as was credited in the favorable Corps of Engineers study.

So, on the basis of these facts and on the basis of the demonstrated local enthusiasm and cooperation, the committee felt strongly that this project is well-justified economically and deserves our support.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Committee on Public Works, I want to commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], for their diligent and outstanding efforts in bringing this omnibus bill to the floor. It has been 3 years since a rivers and harbors beach erosion, flood control and water supply proposal has come to the House and I think these gentlemen are to be commended for their stated policy that in the future an omnibus bill will come up each year. This will insure that projects that have been studied closely by the Corps of Engineers and recommended favorably by Government departments will be acted upon without undue legislative delay.

The actions of the Corps of Engineers, and of course of this committee, in their deliberations in authorizing the Staten Island hurricane protection and beach erosion control will insure that this rapidly expanding community does not suffer the critical damage and heartbreaking effects that have always accompanied the seasonal hurricane assaults on the northeastern coast.

The action of the committee also in approving the East Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay shore erosion and hurricane protection will not only assist this community, which has already poured 11 million cubic yards of fill on this shoreline, but will insure thousands of small craft owners a hurricane seawall across the entrance to Jamaica Bay to insure that their boats will have a protected haven from hurricanes and other heavy storms.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that in the report it is stated that a long period of time has been required from a survey investigation to the final submission of a report to Congress. The committee report stated that the average time for this action has been estimated at something in excess of 10 years. I am happy to note that the two projects on Staten Island and East Rockaway have been studied and authorized within a 2½-year period. This could not have been done had not the Corps of Engineers and the members of this committee been so cooperative in expending their time and energy throughout the hearings to assist in the authorizations of these vital projects.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill now under consideration—the rivers and harbors flood control bill. First, I want to commend the members of the House Public Works Committee on its comprehensive and detailed report on this measure. I know the members labored long—at least 5 weeks of House hearings were held in addition to Senate hearings and many of the 144 projects provided for in this measure had separate days of hearings.

It is of extreme interest to me that the farsighted members of the House Public Works Committee saw fit to include in this legislation provisions to meet the future water supply needs of our northeastern seaboard.

We cannot be indifferent to the warning signals we have received via drought and from which our northeastern seaboard has not recovered. Those of us who represent communities suffering from shortage of water this year are understandably apprehensive about our Nation's dwindling water supply and the plans set forth in title I of this act provide for a good first step in the right direction.

In addition, I want to make note of the fact that it is gratifying to me that two projects for my congressional district have been favorably recommended for consideration.

For the benefit of the economy and easy navigation of Providence River, local authorities of the capital city of my State have long been urging the deepening of the channel to the port of Providence itself. We have been experiencing a serious navigation problem in this area, as many large vessels serving the industries on the river and the harbor have been subjected to tidal delays and serious restrictions on loading. Additionally, large tankers now cannot enter the channel and this in itself seriously affects the economy of what was once a thriving port. The deepening of the river and enlarging of the harbor will add a stimulus to our State's economy at a time when existing industry needs it and when the port of Providence needs new industry. This project is of deep concern to me for its subsequent benefits to my State and I urge its retention in this measure which I hope will be passed with an overwhelming vote.

The second project in the measure, which is also of deep concern to me, is the restoration of Cliff Walk at Newport, R.I., where beach erosion has caused this historic walk to be impassable. Its restoration, well in line with the administration's beautification recomendations, will allow our present and future generations—as our past generations have done—to view the Narragansett Bay area, the scenic beauty of which far exceeds one's expectations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of this bill. I am especially interested in the proposal contained in title I to direct an overall survey of the water needs of the northeastern part of the country, which is now suffering from its fourth consecutive year of bruising drought. This title would direct the Army Engineers to survey the possibilities of establishing some sort of water "grid" within this northeast area, so that available water supplies could be more easily diverted from one area into other areas where the need happened at the moment to be greater. This is what is done at the moment in the case of electric power. Whether the same concept can be entirely successfully applied to water I do not know, but I do think it makes sense for us to take a look at it and see whether it does.

I am interested in this overall idea in particular because it applies to a situation which has existed for some years in my own district, and which may exist in other areas of the country as well. Some 30 years ago as the result of a damaging 1935 flash flood in New York State the Army Engineers proposed the construction of some seven flood-control dams to be built on tributaries of the north branch of the Susquehanna River

for the purpose of impounding and holding back any future flood waters of this kind. Congress authorized their construction, and two of these dams were soon constructed. But funds for the remaining five were never appropriated, largely because of protests from upstream residents whose valuable farmland, homes, and even villages would be destroyed by the dams in question. No repetition of the 1935 flood has ever occurred in the intervening years, partly because of the protection afforded not only by the two dams which have been built but also because of flood walls and other works constructed in the downstream area. Yet the fight between the downstream people and the upstream people—who are my constituents—has gone on with considerable intensity. In fact only this year the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow] and I both had to fight hard to head off a renewed effort to get the appropriation of construction funds begun for two of these five unconstructed dams. We sold our case to the Appropriations Committee of the House, though we only partly sold it to the other body. But both of us are hopeful that the conference committee will accept the point of view of the House committee on this issue and defer any construction of these costly unbudgeted dams for yet another year.

Some 5 years ago, however, in an effort to try to be constructive on this issue, I proposed in an address to the Binghamton, N.Y., Rotary Club in September 1960, that there might be a way to deal with any possible flood waters along the Susquehanna that might menace the city of Binghamton without requiring the expropriation of valuable upstream farmland, and the destruction of homes and villages which the Army Engineers' proposal would entail. I pointed out that the Delaware River Basin, just to the east of the Susquehanna Basin, already included two very large reservoir dams, for the purpose of supplying water for the city of New York, one of these at Cannonsville, and one at Downsville. In fact in the areas of the Cannonsville Dam the Susquehanna and the Delaware Rivers are only about 20 miles apart. My suggestion was that instead of building costly upstream dams, that would have at the best very limited usefulness, we should construct a tunnel between the two river basins, and divert any excess waters from the Susquehanna in time of high water or potential flood into the Delaware River and its reservoirs.

The idea was regarded as rather fantastic at the time. But this is precisely what is now being proposed here in title I. And the proposal is even more relevant than ever, because of course the city of New York is short of water, and the city of Philadelphia also wants more more water in the Delaware too to keep the salt water line below her boundaries.

I do not know just how feasible my idea is. But at least now it can be fully explored, and I am very hopeful that when the survey is completed we can indeed come up with something that will meet the needs of the people of the Binghamton area without causing the destruction that the 30-year-old dam program of the Army Engineers would certainly do.

In this connection, however, Mr. Chairman, I do support very strongly the suggestion that the conduct of this survey should not be turned over to the Army Engineers. It should be given instead to the Water Resources Council, under the control of the Department of the Interior. In my own case, for example, it would be most unlikely that the Army Engineers, investigating my proposal for diverting water from the Susquehanna to the Delaware, would be likely to end up rejecting their own original big dam project. I have found over the years that when it comes to water matters the Army Engineers have no flexibility or imagination. They have only one approach: dams, dams, and more big dams. We certainly do need fresh thinking if the full value of the very unusual studies proposed in title I is to be achieved. Hence I strongly support the change.

One final word, Mr. Chairman. Some fear has been expressed within the Finger Lakes area which I also have the honor to represent, that the construction of such a water grid system might mean that the waters of the Finger Lakes might be tapped to meet the needs of New York City. I am quite confident that this would never be the case. In any case this is only a study. We have pressing water needs enough within our own territory. Besides that, we certainly would not want to destroy one of the great recreational assets of our State and indeed of the entire country for the benefit of just one city. But in any event, Mr. Chairman, I want to serve notice now that I would strongly and vigorously resist any such proposal to tap the water resources of the Finger Lakes for the benefit of any area except the Finger Lakes area itself. It would be completely unwarranted.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, this has been a disastrous year for thousands of Kansans who have experienced great personal and property losses because of floods. The economic impact upon my State has been heavy. Early in the spring, floods in the Walnut River Basin caused approximately $5 to $6 million in damages. In June, rampaging floodwaters of the Arkansas River caused over $20 million damages in Kansas and Colorado. Untold damages also have resulted from flash floods on creeks and other smaller tributaries in Kansas.

But Kansas citizens also know the serious consequences of the prolonged cycles of drought which historically have plagued mankind.

These experiences have brought us to recognize the importance of planning and developing effective flood control measures and at the same time implementing programs to conserve, develop, and fully utilize our precious water resources.

Over $73 million in new authorizations are included in this bill, S. 2300, for flood control projects in the State of Kansas. In addition, this legislation also authorizes several important studies by the Corps of Engineers.

Section 207, title II, of this bill provides for broadening an on-going study of the Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa, Okla., to include navigation as a purpose and to include the reach between Hutchinson and Great Bend, Kans., which are not covered by the outstanding authorities under which such studies are being made.

The estimated cost of the additional studies that would be made, assuming that a complete survey scope investigation might be necessary, is $387,000 and about 6 years will be required to submit a report to Congress. Appropriations would be divided over the 6-year study period.

There is strong support at local, State, and regional levels for a comprehensive multipurpose study, including navigation, of the Arkansas River and tributaries from the headwaters of the Arkansas River to the vicinity of Tulsa, Okla. Such a study also would encompass the needs for flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation, and other beneficial uses of the water resources.

I have received strong statements of support from the Governor of Kansas, the Mid-Arkansas River Basin Water Study Committee and its chairman, Don Pray, of Wichita, the city of Wichita, city of Hutchinson, Kans., the Arkansas Basin Development Association in Kansas, the Kaw Dam and Reservoir Development Association, Inc., and many private citizens.

The interest in determining the feasibility of extension of navigation stems from several significant factors. Navigation is now a reality to Kansas City and Omaha on the Missouri River. By 1970 navigation will be an accomplished fact to Catoosa, a suburb of Tulsa, Okla. Extension of navigation to Wichita and beyond would be a logical next step if this investigation determines it to be feasible and within economic reason.

Admittedly it is difficult to envision in 1965 barges or other large vessels moving down a navigable channel of the Arkansas River from Wichita to Tulsa. However, we would be remiss in our responsibilities to future generations if we failed to explore every possibility of developing, to the fullest extent possible, every resource for the economic development of this area and the Nation.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, the legislation that we consider here today—S. 2300, the omnibus rivers, harbors, and flood protection bill—is absolutely essential to the growth, safety, and continued expansion of our common country.

The bill provides America's cities, towns, and rural areas critically needed protection against the threat and reality of floods—floods that in recent times have racked almost every section of the Nation, causing billions of dollars in destruction, leaving thousands of families homeless, and inflicting incalculable human misery and suffering.

This legislation will improve and increase the Nation's water supply at a time when the severe, growing shortage of pure water is a cause for national alarm.

The bill will further strengthen the great network of rivers and harbors that

means so very much to our national economy and to our international trade program.

Finally, this legislation will combat the ever-present menace of erosion; it will increase the use of hydroelectric power and it will create new recreational areas in a nation that is fast outgrowing existing facilities for outdoor recreation, such as fishing, boating, swimming, and camping.

Let me briefly discuss the benefits of just one of the programs authorized in this legislation. I refer to the Athens local flood protection projects for my 10th District of Ohio.

This project would prevent land and property damages from smaller floods that have plagued Athens and Ohio University for so many years; it would substantially reduce damages from larger floods, such as those that caused nearly $2 million in destruction to the Athens area in 1963–64.

Importantly, the flood protection project would open up almost 500 acres of undeveloped land in the Athens flood plain for utilization by Ohio University and private industry. Specifically, it would protect 235 acres on which the university has invested $30 million in physical improvements, and it would permit immediately additional construction of $41 million by Ohio University on land that is now undeveloped.

The Athens project also would result in average annual benefits of $460,000 in increased property values and local tax revenues; improved water quality, recreation, tourism, and, of course, in flood protection.

I would be remiss if I did not commend the House Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Flood Control for the tremendous work it has done in putting this legislation together. I particularly commend the distinguished chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee [Mr. JONES] for his valuable assistance in my efforts to secure authorization of the Athens local flood protection plan. The people of my area had been striving for 24 long and frustrating years to obtain this project. I am delighted that I was able to bring it to the point where success depends now only on the affirmative vote of this Congress.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and the ranking minority member, my colleague from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and all their able colleagues on the fine work they have done in presenting this bill to the House. Long hearings and careful study of the projects in the public works omnibus authorization bill have produced this important bill, which is vital to the national interest.

I would like to comment on two projects in the bill, which are in my home district, Duval County, Fla.

One is the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of the Budget approved project to deepen the Jacksonville Harbor from 34 to 38 feet. In recent years millions of dollars have been spent by local interests on improving the port which serves as an important port of entry from the Atlantic Ocean and joins with the St. Johns River to serve a wide area for commerce in the South. The Jacksonville Port Authority, led by a distinguished group of local citizens, has been established and the proposed deepening of the Jacksonville Harbor is needed in line with the authority's goals to improve shipping and commerce and to handle the great amount of traffic which has been generated.

The Jacksonville Harbor is destined to play an even more important role in the waterway traffic of the Nation. The Cross-Florida Barge Canal, which will link the oil-producing States of the West to the oil-consuming States of the East for the benefit of millions of Americans and the national security, is now being constructed at an adequate pace. The completion of the canal will mean even more traffic by water between the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

The discovery of new phosphate deposits in northeast Florida increases the need for the harbor improvements, and one large international company has already spent very substantial sums to provide for a shipping area, including a huge dock, to handle the increased phosphate shipments.

The proposed project would deepen the harbor to the Jacksonville municipal docks and terminals. I am pushing for further deepening nearer the center of Jacksonville, which has the support of local interests, and I am hopeful in the near future that this will gain approval by the Corps of Engineers.

The other Duval County project included in this bill is a 10-year program, approved by the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of the Budget, for beach erosion control along the shoreline of the county. The local sponsor, the Board of County Commissioners of Duval County, has agreed to meet the non-Federal cost of the project, which will involve some $3.5 million over the 10 years.

This is a very important project for the shoreline of the county. During the last 3 years, storms and Hurricane Dora have battered the beach area, which includes a growing population of now over 20,000 persons. A program for beach nourishment is badly needed, and the Corps of Engineers have developed a plan of improvement which will help solve the beach erosion problem and protect valuable public and private buildings and developments along the shoreline. Included in the master plan is beach erosion control at the Mayport Naval Station, a key base from which carriers and destroyers are directed for worldwide duty.

Mr. Chairman, both the Jacksonville Harbor project and the beach erosion plan for Duval County are essential to the national interest. I am happy to support this bill.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House authorizes nearly $2 billion in public works, including flood control projects, water supply, water treatment, and similar purposes. It is my understanding that nearly 42 States reap in some degree the largess of this legislation. Yet Wyoming, for reasons long a puzzle to its citizens, is dealt a summary and resounding zero in the authorizations under this bill.

Recently the town of Mountain View in Uinta County suffered flood damage which will require expenditures well in excess of a quarter of a million dollars. The Smith Fork River will need riprapping for nearly a mile on both of its banks in order to stabilize the course and to make sure that there will not be repetition of this year's damage. Conservative estimates in excess of one-half million dollars tabbed the damage which was done to the parks and shorelines of the much-used Flaming Gorge Reservoir which is mainly in Wyoming and in a portion of Utah.

A disaster area designation this summer would have done much to assist these Wyoming communities and interests that were so severely damaged. But in the direct proportion to the damage of Colorado and of areas in other parts of America, Wyoming's damage was, of course, minimal, but a ruined farm is just as ruined if you are a Wyoming farmer as your interest should you be one of many others similarly damaged in the larger States.

Still in all, when Wyoming's Governor made application to Director Ellington of the Office of Emergency Planning for a disaster designation for Wyoming, we in Wyoming were categorically refused assistance, and even refused a visit of OEP officials in order that our evidence for such a designation might be examined first-hand. Indeed as Wyoming's only Congressman, I know that I was not notified, not appraised, nor in anyway contacted by the Office of Emergency Planning regarding this designation. I am further informed that neither of Wyoming's representatives in the other body of Congress were informed or contacted upon this categorical refusal for flood aid to the people or the political subdivisions of Wyoming.

In addition, Wyoming now has a project called the Fontennelle Dam which has sprung a serious leak in it and has endangered life and property along the entire Green River Valley.

I am aware that this bill will pass with an overwhelming majority since some 42 States have an economic interest in its passage; I am also aware that a voice vote against it is somewhat a voice in the wilderness with no intention of being provincial but with the hope that I can attract attention to an inequity, I ought to vote against its passage today as a measure of protest against neglect and abuse which I feel has been dealt to my State in this legislation. It would seem to me that equity itself ought to dictate the consideration of every State in the Union when $2 billion is packaged in one omnibus bill for projects benefiting the citizens of this Nation.

I shall, however reluctantly, support this bill in the hope that Wyoming's days of such neglect in this regard and its days of being treated as something short of a colony or territory may soon be coming to an end.

I hope other Members of this Congress from those States benefiting from this bill may take notice and remember this

action when big and beautiful Wyoming presents its projects in the years to come.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300, the 1965 omnibus public works authorization bill.

This bill, as reported by the House Committee on Public Works, would authorize construction of two projects of importance to many people in the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, which I represent.

First, it would provide authorization for a dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Skunk River, about 5 miles north of the city of Ames. This project is needed for flood protection in the Skunk River Valley, which includes four counties in the district which I represent.

The Skunk River has caused extensive flood damage to crops and property in this area. In June 1947, for example, the river flooded about 78,000 acres, causing a total of $3,878,000 in damage.

This project was not included in S. 2300, as passed by the Senate on July 27, because the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was not able to transmit its recommendation to the Congress until August 12.

However, the House Committee on Public Works has included the Skunk River project in the bill under consideration today, and I am hopeful that this project will remain in the version of S. 2300 that is finally passed by the Congress.

Second, this bill contains authorization for construction of a flood control project at Marshalltown, Iowa, which is needed to protect portions of the city against high waters on the Iowa River and Linn Creek.

This project is also vitally needed, since flooding at Marshalltown has been persistent and costly. Since June 1947, for example, six major floods have hit Marshalltown, either from the Iowa River or Linn Creek, causing a total of more than $750,000 in property damage to the community. This total excludes an estimated $55,000 in damage caused this spring by flood waters that swept through Marshalltown, forcing residents to resort to emergency measures to keep the high waters at least partly under control.

The Marshalltown project is included in the Senate version of S. 2300. In addition, the Senate voted to provide a $50,000 appropriation for planning work on the Marshalltown project when it voted approval August 23 of H.R. 9220, the omnibus public works appropriations bill.

The House of Representatives, of course, was unable to appropriate any funds for the Marshalltown project when it passed H.R. 9220 on June 22, since the project was not authorized at that time.

However, the House and Senate conferees have not yet met to resolve the differences in the two versions of H.R 9220. If the House approves the bill before it today, including authorization for the Marshalltown project, it will be possible to include the $50,000 in planning funds in the final version of the public works appropriations bill.

Prompt and favorable action by the Congress is needed if the Skunk River and Marshalltown projects are to proceed without delay, and I therefore urge the House to pass the authorization bill under consideration today.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, S. 2300.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but be provoked when I hear this bill referred to as pork barrel legislation. The projects carried in this and prior bills on the same subject have authorized great projects which have directly benefited our own citizens. The bill before us today provides for flood control, navigation projects, hurricane protection, and so forth.

This bill directly affects my own congressional district. It authorizes a project to provide hurricane protection in Jamaica Bay, N.Y., which borders the entire southern portion of my district.

Jamaica Bay is 8 miles long, 4 miles wide, and covers an area of approximately 26 square miles. Communities in my district which border on the bay are Howard Beach, Rosedale—reached by Hook Creek—and the John F. Kennedy International Airport—a veritable city unto itself.

Howard Beach, including Hamilton Beach, is experiencing a tremendous and rapid growth. The poplulation figure of 13,000 given in the Engineers' report is based on the 1960 census which is no longer realistic—entire communities have sprung up within the boundaries of Howard Beach since 1960. Howard Beach is constantly under the threat of flooding in the shore area from any abnormally high tides.

Rosedale is not physically on Jamaica Bay as is Howard Beach, but Hook Creek is the means by which flooding, at times up to 3 feet, comes to this community.

The John F. Kennedy International Airport, entirely within my congressional district, occupies approximately 4,900 acres of land bordering on Jamaica Bay between Bergen Basin and head of bay. The airport continues to expand as marshland is filled in for runway extensions, and so forth. Flooding from severe storms causes disruption to flight activities. As this airport expands its activities, there is an increase in the demand for gasoline and other supplies, much of which reaches the airport by water transportation, using the navigation channels in Jamaica Bay.

If we can secure hurricane protection, I can see untold benefits accruing to untold numbers of people. Jamaica Bay has the potential for becoming a great recreation and commercial area. With adequate protection, we may look forward to a tremendous increase in boating, swimming, fishing, and other water-related activities. These activities will, of course, bring demands for business facilities to supply the needs of these interests, and so it goes with demand and supply. Business brings profits and profits are taxed and income flows to the Treasury. In Queens County we seek additional business investment—I know that this project will be another incentive for such investment.

I have referred to the project which directly affects the Seventh Congressional District of New York. I am sure that the other projects in this bill are just as vital to other areas as the Jamaica Bay project is to my district.

I urge the passage of S. 2300.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to comment upon the importance of title I of S. 2300. Title I authorizes the preparation of a regional plan for meeting the future water needs of the northeastern seaboard. Title I authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army through the Chief of Engineers "to prepare a plan to meet the long-range water needs of the Northeastern United States." The plan, according to title I, would provide for a system of major reservoirs, aqueducts between major river basins, and purification plants.

Significantly title I recognizes that the Federal Government has an obligation to develop a national policy in the vitally important area of water resources. The report of the Committee on Public Works points out that State and even interstate arrangements are no longer adequate to meet the water needs of the great megalopolis of the northeastern seaboard. The committee concludes:

> Now we face a situation that requires collective action at a still higher level—the level of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, while I note the foresight contained in title I, I do not think that the proposed survey for the Northeast will be sufficient to meet the great water supply problems of that area. At present there is a multiplicity of jurisdictions and policies concerning water resources. Although the need for Federal coordination is recognized, there is no overall national water policy. Of course, the plan envisioned in title I will be helpful and could make a major contribution to an overall policy, but it is not a substitute for an overall policy.

The water shortage crisis in the Northeast makes clear the need to establish a national policy and a uniform Federal standard governing the use of all water resources constitutionally subject to Federal supervision.

I have introduced the Federal Water Commission Act of 1965, H.R. 10244, to accomplish this through a Federal Water Commission. This bill vests authority to enforce Federal standards in an independent regulatory agency comparable to the Federal Power Commission.

A key provision in the measure permits the Commission to suspend the application of the Federal water use and water pollution law if it finds that regional, State, or local regulations meet Federal standards. Any such action by the Commission would be reviewed after the elapse of 5 years in order to assure continuous coordination in the development and use of Federal water resources.

Other provisions of my proposed Federal Water Commission Act would—

Establish a Federal Water Commission of 5 members appointed by the President to develop and administer and enforce an integrated national policy of water use and water pollution control;

Provide Federal licensing procedures governing the withdrawal and pollution of all interstate, navigable, and coastal waters where existing laws fall below Federal standards;

Set a Federal standard of beneficial use applicable to all public and private activities which draw on water under Federal jurisdiction or result in their pollution;

Specifically protect all existing water rights as long as they are not injurious, and exempt all withdrawals of water by individual householders for normal domestic use;

Provide the Commission with special powers to cope with acute water shortages and emergencies; and

Delete a provision in the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 which would prohibit the Delaware River Basin Commission from cooperating effectively with the proposed Hudson River Basin Commission to increase New York City's water supplies.

Although title I of S. 2300 provides for a constructive plan, Congress has failed to face the hard fact that we must have an integrated national policy of water conservation, water development, and water pollution control. We are developing a national electric power grid. Water is obviously a scarcer resource and far more vulnerable to the caprices of nature. The establishment of a Federal Water Commission will result in the allocation of water resources to secure an ample, constant water supply for all citizens of the United States.

Title I of S. 2300 is a step in the direction of establishing a national water policy, but I urge that there be hearings as soon as possible on H.R. 10244.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, under the rule the bill and the committee substitute now in the bill will be read by titles instead of by sections. The Clerk will now read by titles the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby recognizes that assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to prepare a plan to meet the long-range water needs of the Northeastern United States. This plan shall provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of (1) a system of major reservoirs to be located within those river basins of the Northeastern United States which drain into the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into the Atlantic Ocean north of the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into Lake Ontario and those that drain into the Saint Lawrence River, (2) major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest, and (3) major purification facilities. Such plan shall provide for appropriate financial participation by the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other local interests.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain those reservoirs, conveyance facilities, and purification facilities, which are recommended in the plan prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and which are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of the plan established in accordance with this section.

Mr. CRAMER (interrupting the reading of the title). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF ALABAMA

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 37, strike out the sentence which begins on line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89–80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States."

On page 37, line 11, delete "shall" and substitute in lieu thereof "may".

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I discussed earlier in the debate on the pending proposal. What this seeks to do is to allay the apprehensions of some people that the Water Resources Planning Act would be violated by title I. This is intended to make clear that the Water Resources Planning Act will be honored in making presentations and representations in any plans that may be submitted by the Corps of Engineers for the consideration of the Congress.

The second amendment is on page 37 and provides for deletion of the word "shall" and places in lieu thereof the word "may".

This is to give ample assurances that the Water Resources Planning Act is further recognized as being the strong arm of water resources development.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendments that the gentleman has proposed. Without repeating what was discussed in the general debate, and the questions I asked the gentleman relating to these amendments which I understood would be offered, I trust the gentleman agrees now, as I said then, that these amendments, of course, relate to the Water Resources Planning Act and will guarantee—plus section 203 in the bill—that the States, the local agencies—and I am now referring to the Water Resources Planning Act—the States, localities, private enterprise, in cooperation with all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprises and others concerned, with the conservation, development, and utilization of water, will be consulted regarding any such plan.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman. That is the purpose of the amendments, to make assurance doubly sure.

Mr. CRAMER. And likewise, changing "shall" to "may" means that the corps will have greater flexibility in determining what will be the Federal responsibility in these different areas suggested in the authorizing language, including the area of water purification and transmission lines.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the aim I seek in the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I support the amendment. I think it will benefit this northeastern water study and plan proposal.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Alabama on the excellent job he has done in providing us with this Northeast water planning provision, particularly with respect to the amendments to bring into play the Water Resources Council. This is something that will be invaluable to communities such as my own, that are suffering under the severest kind of drought situation.

I would like to ask one question for the sake of the legislative record, if I may. That is, who is actually to do the planning work under this provision as amended? It is not 100 percent clear whether the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers will do this work or whether it is to be done in cooperation with all the agencies involved.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It would have to be with all the agencies involved. I would like to inform the gentleman from New York that in the submission of a project there may be involved some 35 agencies and activities of the Federal Government. It was never the intention of the committee in writing title I to exclude the Council from participating in the promulgation of the plan. That was the suspicion that was raised, without, I am afraid, close examination of the existing law. But I repeat to the gentleman what I said earlier in the debate; section 203 of the bill provides that the procedures adopted in the Flood Control Act of 1944 would be continued. Therefore it will assure to the Congress that the plans and programs would have to be submitted with comments from the various agencies of the States and other involved principals in the project.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, suppose there were disagreement between the Water Resources Council and, say, the Corps of Engineers on a particular point

in these plans? Which agency is the coordinating agency?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The submission would be made by the Corps of Engineers, but it would have to contain the points of disagreement; and the Congress itself will resolve the disagreement. It does not mean by passing this title that there will not be problems which will always be inherent in any type of arrangement involving so many agencies. I sincerely hope that the Council members will use their good offices to bring about harmony in resolving disagreements when they arise.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] are agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows: Page 38, line 12:

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single- and multiple-purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10,000,000. No appropriation shall be made to construct, operate, or maintain any such project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report of such proposed project, including all relevant data and all costs.

(b) Any water resource development project authorized to be constructed by this section shall be subject to the same requirements of local cooperation as it would be if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10,000,000 or more.

SEC. 202. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law, the authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the late on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 203. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 204. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

Saint John River Basin

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

Housatonic River Basin

The projects for flood protection on the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers at Derby and Danbury, Connecticut, are hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

New England-Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

Long Island Sound area

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

Hudson River Basin

The project for flood protection at Yonkers, Saw Mill River, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 258, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,924,000.

New York-Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

Elizabeth River Basin, New Jersey

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 249, Eighth-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

Rahway River Basin, New Jersey

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

Neuse River Basin

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

Middle Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

Flint River Basin

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

Central and southern Florida basin

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

South Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

Phillippi Creek Basin, Florida

The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

Lower Mississippi River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $181,109,000 and the authorization for the lower Mississippi River project is hereby increased accordingly, except that (1) any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, Floodway shall be required as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928, (2) the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, (3) the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and (4) the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be the same as is required by paragraph (q) under the heading "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The project for the St. Francis River, Missouri and Arkansas within Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,372,000.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army in that document shall apply with respect to the Seabrook Lock feature of the project. The estimated cost is $56,235,000.

Ouachita River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in the House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

Red River Basin

The proviso in the paragraph under the center heading "Red River Basin" in the Act of December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 840, Public Law 88–253) relating to the Waurika project, Oklahoma, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to acquire lands and interests therein required for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir as described in Senate Document Numbered 33, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $418,000, whenever the Secretary of the Interior approves the establishment of such a refuge.".

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

The project for Sandars, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, as authorized in the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 187), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway crossing Pat Mayse Reservoir to replace the present FM Highway 1499 across Sanders Creek, at an estimated cost of $310,000. Such crossing shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

Gulf of Mexico

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,004,000.

Rio Grande Basin

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

Arkansas River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 270, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

The project for flood protection at Little Rock, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 55, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $363,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

The project for flood protection on Crutcho Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 47, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,801,000.

The project for Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colorado, House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-fourth Congress, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in paragraph 2(a) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 1954, published in said document, local interests shall maintain the channel of Purgatoire River through the city of Trinidad. The conditions set forth in paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of said report shall be applicable to the project.

The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

Missouri River Basin

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000 except that such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, shall be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the James River and tributaries, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 266, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,083,000.

The project for flood control on the Fishing River and tributaries, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,260,000.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $218,009,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of Linneus Reservoir on Locust Creek, St. Catherine Reservoir on East Yellow Creek, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, nor hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonsburg Reservoir on Grand River.

The project for flood protection on the Platte River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 262, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,889,000.

The project for flood protection on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297; Public Law 85-500) is hereby modified to waive the requirement that local interests contribute in cash 2.16 per centum of the actual construction cost of all items of work provided by the United States.

Ohio River Basin

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Hocking River, Ohio, in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,520,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided,* That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further,* That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further,* That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000. Prior to initiation of construction the Secretary of the Army shall prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

Red River of the north basin

The project for flood protection on the Roseau River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,550,000.

Upper Mississippi River Basin

The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimtaed increased Federal cost of $3,498,000, if local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for Ames Dam and Reservoir, Skunk River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendtaions of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 267, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,893,000.

The projects for flood protection at Marshalltown and Waterloo on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $17,570,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

The project on the Des Moines River for flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, House Document Numbered 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944, (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified to eliminate the requirement recommended in paragraph 10(a)(2) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 13, 1943, that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains.

Great Lakes Basin

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

Little Colorado River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

Gila River Basin

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenadtions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000, except that the development of recreation and fishand wildlife facilities shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

Eel River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

Sacramento River Basin

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

The project for the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir with supplemental channel improvements, Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 259, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

San Francisco Bay Area

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

Whitewater River Basin

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000. The estimated cost is $3,442,000.

Santa Ana River Basin

The project for flood protection on Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,750,000.

San Diego River Basin

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000, except that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work done by such interests on such project after the date of enactment of this Act, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Columbia River Basin

The projects for the Lower Grande Ronde and Catherine Creek dams and reservoirs, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, Oregon, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 280, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,440,000. The Chief of Engineers shall construct, operate, and maintain such projects.

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

The project for acquisition of additional lands for waterfowl management at John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $706,000, except that the parcels of land, in Oregon, between the Columbia River and the management area boundary within sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of Township 4 North, Range 25 East, Willamette Meridian, as shown on plate 1 of the Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, estimated at 611.02 acres, shall not be part of the management area, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase such additional lands in sections 22, 27, 29, and 30, Township 5 North, Range 26 East, Willamette Meridian, outside the present indicated management area boundary on plate 1, as he determines necessary to replace the lands so excluded.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. In the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, the Federal Government shall not construct such local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, until said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that (1) it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and (2) that such reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. Such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coast lines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a frame-

work plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana (water supply).

Boyer River, Iowa.

Keokuk, Iowa.

Mississippi River, north of Dubuque, Iowa.

Black Hawk Creek, Iowa.

Mount Vernon, Indiana.

Orange Lake Basin, Florida.

Mayfield Creek, Kentucky.

Hatchie River and Tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.

Spoon River, Illinois.

Grand (Neosho) River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Verdigris River, Kansas.

Verdigris River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Sanderson, Texas.

Abbeville, South Carolina.

All streams which drain directly to Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, California.

Big Mineral Creek, Texas, particularly with reference to construction of a highway bridge.

Irondequoit Creek, New York, and tributaries, including Allens Creek, New York.

Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California to determine advisability of protection work against storm and tidal waves.

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding the first proviso in section 201 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes", approved May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), the authorization in section 204 of such Act of projects for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Washington, shall expire on June 10, 1970, unless local interests shall before such date furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required local cooperation in such project will be furnished.

SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of their contract numbered DA-41-443-eng-939 with Hill County, Texas, which are subject to flooding; such roads being a part of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, at an estimated cost of $130,000.

SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, subject to the provisions of this section, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the tract of land lying above elevation 454 feet mean sea level now occupied by such Society at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under a lease executed by the Secretary of the Army and dated February 10, 1958.

(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be made upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and upon such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States. In determining the fair market value of the property, the Secretary shall exclude the value of any improvements made by or at the expense of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(c) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized by this section shall be borne by the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(d) Title to the property authorized to be conveyed by this section shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 211. The authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, West Virginia, hereafter shall be known and designated as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which the authorized Justice Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

SEC. 212. In recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Washington, by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such project and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by him approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army. Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the project for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890). Unless construction of the project is undertaken within three years from the date of enactment of this section, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

SEC. 213. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with the State of New York, political subdivisions thereof, and appropriate agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins within the State of New York, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate participation by the Department of the Army in carrying out such plans.

SEC. 214. The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities at reservoir areas", approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509), is hereby amended by striking out "before November 1, 1956,".

SEC. 215. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, an investigation and study of San Francisco Bay, California, including San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto, with a view toward determining the feasibility of, and extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes.

SEC. 216. The Secretary of the Army shall pay to any bona fide lessee or permittee owning improvements, which are or which were totally situated or partially situated on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of such improvements, which have been or will be rendered inoperative or be otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kansas, as determined by the Secretary, or by the United States District Court for the District of Kansas on which is conferred jurisdiction for this purpose. In no case shall the owner of such improvements receive dual compensation for any part of said improvements as a result of this section or otherwise. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide the funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this section from any moneys appropriated for the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project.

SEC. 217. The Secretay of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $3,000,000.

SEC. 218. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to accept orders from other Federal departments and agencies for work or services and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

SEC. 219. Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500,000".

SEC. 220. The Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.

SEC. 221. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

Mr. JONES of Alabama (interrupting reading of title). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the title be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, the gentleman from Alabama is not going to attempt to cut off debate or discussion of the amendments on this title through such a request, is he?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, no, I do not intend to make any such request so long as there is a reasonable amount of time used in debating it. If there is a protracted discussion that is repetitious, then we would have to consider that approach.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Alabama agrees, does he not, that if there is any controversy on the bill—and I believe there is a minimum of controversy—this title is where it will appear and where the amendments will take place?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, that is true.

Mr. CRAMER. And, there are three or four amendments that should be adequately debated, and I ask the assurance of the gentleman from Alabama that he

will not attempt to cut off debate on those amendments.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No; I do not intend to do that.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 58, after line 8, insert the following:

"The project for the Devils Jumps Reservoir, Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $151,000,000."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, Devils Jumps Dam would be built on the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River in McCreary County, Ky. The reservoir would lie in Wayne, McCreary, and Pulaski Counties in Kentucky and Scott, Fentress, Morgan, Anderson, Campbell, and Pickett Counties in Tennessee. The dam would be 483 feet high and would have a length of 6,250 feet, and would be built of concrete. The reservoir would cover approximately 37,000 acres and have a drainage area of approximately 1,383 square miles.

The purpose of the dam would be flood control, power, and recreation. The power output would amount, on an average, to 475 million kilowatt-hours per year. Use of this power would be managed by the Southeastern Power Administration. It is estimated that the sale of this power would bring in approximately $12,079,000 annually.

It is estimated that 800,000 people would visit this area annually.

The benefit-cost ratio would be 1.8 to 1 so that the entire cost could be paid in 50 years. This project has one of the highest benefit-cost ratios of any dam proposed to be built in this area.

The people of McCreary County in which the dam would be built have a median family income of approximately $1,800 per year, an da per capita income of $516 per year.

This project is accepted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Federal Power Commission, the State of Kentucky, the State of Tennessee: it has been recommended by the Army Corps of Engineers and there is no objection by the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce.

The Southeastern Power Administration is convinced that the power can be marketed at rates sufficient to recover all power costs within a 50-year period.

This project has been included in the Senate omnibus bill for rivers and harbors and has been passed by the other body three times, including this year. Since this is recognized by the other body to be a worthwhile project, I strongly urge this body to reconsider and vote for inclusion of this amendment.

Building this dam in McCreary County would tremendously improve the economy of that area and the entire Commonwealth of Kentucky. Industry always follows cheap sources of electric power and would undoubtedly move into this area. It would be transformed just as the Tennessee Valley area has been. Devils Jumps is a natural resource and is a property owned by the people. It would be used for their benefit and could best be used by construction of the Devils Jumps hydroelectric dam.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the gentleman who offers this amendment is sincere in having this project approved. That is only logical, for he is representing the people in his area.

Our committee had only limited hearings on this project this year, and did not allow the opponents to be heard; therefore, we do not have an adequate record in the printed record of the hearings of the full committee and subcommittee on this project to guide the Members of the House at this time.

Secondly, our subcommittee did have extensive hearings on this project 3 years ago, the last time a similar omnibus bill was before the House. In those hearings it was brought out that the TVA, which would be the nearest major user of power, does not desire or intend to use any power that might be produced by this project. We asked the Secretary of the Interior to indicate where this power would be used. It was indicated by the private power companies in the area that they did not require power from this source. It was brought out in the testimony it would be necessary to push this power up to areas in Indiana, Ohio, and even Michigan in order to provide some market for it, even though none of those areas indicated they desired the power. The result of the testimony 3 years ago indicated no assured consumer demand for this power, and because of that fact the Flood Control Subcommittee 3 years ago voted against this project. There has been no change so far as the uncertain use of this power is concerned, and for the Federal taxpayers to spend $151 million for this purpose now, without full hearings, would be highly unjustified.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great hue and cry from the proponents of this project that the area in which this plant will be constructed is in the Appalachia area and will provide much needed jobs for the unemployed. But let me squash that argument here and now.

NINETY-EIGHT PERCENT PUBLIC POWER

In the first place, the construction of this project—a hydroelectric project—would displace forever power supplied by coal-fired steam electric-generating plants consuming almost one-quarter million tons of coal per year, adding to unemployment and the very reasons that many of the Appalachia areas today are depressed is because of the loss of business by the coal industry. This will only compound the problem. Furthermore, if the Government hydroelectric power comes into this area it will prevent expansion of many existing generating facilities in Ohio and other depressed areas, perhaps even curtailing operations of those existing plants with subsequent reduction in tax revenue to the locality, making them even more depressed. It would lead to further reductions in coal consumption—increased unemployment, adding to the already enormous burdens of these underemployed areas located in Kentucky, Ohio, parts of Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Michigan as well.

Furthermore, any power produced by a Government project at this site will necessarily be marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration. Presently the Southeastern Power Administration does not have authority to go out of its original 10-State area and the Southeastern Power Administration has been marketing most of its power through TVA. However, TVA on at least two occasions has expressed its opposition to the purchase of any of this power because of its high cost. Furthermore, the Southeastern Power Administration has admitted it would have to go into Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and probably part of Pennsylvania to market this power and it has not made any study of the needs of those areas for additional power and has little knowledge of the area.

Furthermore, there are presently in operation five existing power projects with a combined output of 595,000 kilowatts, all of which are now under sale to TVA. In addition there is the Barkley project with a capacity of 130,000 kilowatts which is or about to be placed in operation.

There are an additional five Federal hydroelectric projects within the basin with a combined total of 212,500 kilowatts which have already been authorized but have not been constructed. So you now have in this area either authorized or constructed projects totaling a combined capacity of 937,500 kilowatts in addition to the 480,000 represented by Devils Jump. TVA has expressed a desire to renegotiate its present contract with Southeastern Power Administration so it can be released from some of the power it is now taking. In other words, the TVA has more now than it needs, and desires to get out of the obligation to market all of the existing power to say nothing of additional power represented by the Barklet project and the five additional projects heretofore authorized but not constructed. So quite obviously, there is no need for this additional 480,000 kilowatts of peaking power in this area and by Southeastern Power Administration's own admission, they have little or no knowledge of a market elsewhere.

Furthermore, using the latest figures available, those of 1964, the simultaneous peak load of investor-owned companies in Ohio alone, were 11.2 million kilowatts. There generating capacity was 14 million kilowatts, 2.8 million kilowatts in excess of need, or in other words, 25 percent in excess of the load

required—more than an ample reserve capacity. In addition to these there is an extremely large block of capacity available to most of the utilties in Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, and Pennsylvania from the Ohio Valley Electric Corp. due to cutbacks in demand from the Atomic Energy Commission installation at Waverly, Ohio. Therefore, there is no need and no use for this enormous capacity that would be created by Devils Jump in any of the outlying areas outside of Southeastern Power Administration's present authority or more technically known as "power supply areas." Further, dependent upon the success of TVA in rescinding or revising its contract with Southeastern Power Administration to reduce the power purchased by it, Southeastern Power Administration will have the problem of finding markets for excess power of somewhere between 342,000 kilowatts and 937,000 kilowatts of Cumberland River Basin power and in addition to that the problem of some 480,000 kilowatts merely compounds the problem and is a complete waste of Federal funds to produce a product that is absolutely not needed.

Now to deal specifically with the justification of the cost-benefit analysis of the project. First let me remind you that Senate Document 97 setting forth the procedures by which projects of this type must be justified states that the usual practice is to measure the benefit in terms of the cost in achieving the same results by the most likely alternative means that would exist in the absence of the project. Neither in the hearings of the other body nor in the hearings of the House is there any evidence concerning what alternative method or means were used to determine the cost of achieving the same results by the Corps of Engineers. We do not know whether they used steam, pumped storage, jet engine, nuclear, or just what other types of generation or combinations thereof were used. However, the testimony before the House introduced by investor-owned companies, outlined three different types of installation which would achieve the same results. Three alternative methods of producing peaking capacity and energy, which are basic methods used in the electric utility industries were presented by the private investor-owned companies, each of which would be located in the areas which are claimed as potential markets by Devils Jump. The three were an overpressure system, pumped storage proposal and an existing jet installation.

Further, a steam generating unit presently under construction on the Wabash River in Indiana could be expanded for a capital investment of $10.5 million, which would provide the same peaking capacity equivalent to the Devils Jump capacity which is estimated to cost $167 million. Furthermore, the annual cost of this capacity and energy would amount to only approximately $2 million, about 30 percent of the annual cost of the Devils Jump power.

The second alternative is a pumped storage project which could supply comparable peaking capacity at a total investment of $65 million at an annual cost of roughly $5 million, thereby producing the same type power annually at 82 percent of the annual cost of Devils Jump power with a capital investment of $65 million as compared to capital investment of $165 million at Devils Jump, and there are a number of pumped storage sites available in the Devils Jump area.

The third alternative—the jet engine—was used in a recent completed installation. This type of installation has the decided advantage of flexibility and can be located at the load center, thereby eliminating very substantial transmission investments and power loss. An analysis of this third alternative showed that 592,000 kilowatts, over 100,000 more kilowatts of peaking capacity than that claimed at Devils Jump, could be supplied by this third alternative by $39 million investment, or less than one-fourth of the Devils Jump investment, at an annual production cost of $4.8 million, or about 81 percent of the annual cost of the Devils Jump power. As usual, there is a maze of conflicting figures presented by the proponents of this project and the corps. In the hearings both in the other body and in the House, the Corps of Engineers in some instances used annual costs of $6.1 million, in others $6.8 million. It used, in some cases, benefits of $12 million, and in others benefits of $10.4 million. It used different interest rates. For example, it originally used 2½ percent, 2⅞ percent, then 3⅛ percent interest. It used different amortization and replacement costs and, in some cases, 100 years lifetime as opposed to 50-year lifetime.

Now you take all the fancy formulas and high-faluting methods to figure these projects you want but, when it all boils down the project only pays out through the sale of electricity. Now Southeastern Power Administration says it will sell this power. The project is to produce 475,000 kilowatt-hours annually. In 1962, the average rate for all power sold by Southeastern Power Administration was only 5.4 mills per killowatt hour. Take the claimed 475 million kilowatts and multiply by 5.4 mills, assuming you can sell this power, gives you an annual revenue of $2.5 million. Now compare this against what the proponents say it will cost annually to produce this power, that is $6.1 million or $6.8 both of which are the Corps figures and you have a loss annually of $3.6 million or $4.3 depending upon the figures you take. As a matter of fact, the cost would even be greater if you used the same interest rate the Federal Government is required to pay. Remember this: None of these figures includes the market cost, which is over $50 thousand annually, nor do they include the transmission cost or losses due to transmission. Further there would have to be an additional capital investment for the construction of transmission lines which are not now in existence in the area, and one last thing, if this project is constructed by the Federal Government, the Corps estimates that the annual loss of taxes would be $3.67 million and the sale of this power by Southeastern Power Administration would not return a sufficient sum to even offset this cost annually. So if you include the annual loss, representing the difference from the sale of power and the cost of production or the sum of $3.6 million, taking the lesser figure plus the annual loss of taxes of $3.67 million, you have a total annual loss of this project in excess of $7 million annually and over the life of the project, depending on what figure you use, a 50-year or a 100-year basis, you have a $350 million loss or a $700 million loss to the general taxpayer. I submit to you gentlemen that this project is not feasible, it is not needed in the area, it is a raid on the Treasury, adding to the enormous deficit, and creates additional loss of jobs and great hardships in the already depressed coal industry and Appalachian areas and this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, there is no flood control in this project. The Corps of Engineers has stated it did not take any benefit for flood control in this project because it does not add any flood control benefits to the system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me say that because this project is so controversial the committee did not even request testimony from the Corps of Engineers. No opportunity to cross-examine any of the witnesses nor the testimony placed in the record was given to the opponents of this project because the committee having had considerable experience and knowledge of this project over the years knew and felt that it was not justified and should not be included in the bill. As a matter of fact in 1962 and again in 1963 an effort was made to include it and it was defeated on both occasions. Again this year the committee obviously felt the project was not justified and therefore it was not placed in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER] has been a very worthy and extremely able advocate of this project. I know of no other person who has worked harder or more ably in behalf of his district and this project. He has been very sincere and persuasive and I regret I find myself in disagreement with him. He has represented his people well.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee sustains the position of the Public Works Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OF MR. CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offer by Mr. CLARK: On page 41, strike out lines 3 through 12, inclusive.

(Mr. CLARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, and Members, first, I intend to support all of the projects in the bill with the exception of the request for the authorization of $227 million to the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the St. John's River in Maine. This is the largest single item

in the bill and constitutes more than 10 percent of the total authorization. I am opposed to the Dickey project for the following reasons:

First, the project, despite its ultimate cost of more than $300 million, received only cursory examination on the Senate side. Public hearings were not held there. Furthermore, House hearings revealed that the project has not been adequately studied by either the Corps of Engineers or the Department of the Interior.

Second, the Secretary of the Interior admitted in public testimony that the private companies in the region had not even been consulted on the need for this power, and further that there were no marketing plans for the more than 95 percent of the power that will be exported from Maine.

Third, the project is opposed by the majority of the New England Congressmen because it will not even achieve its stated goal of helping to reduce the cost of power in the New England area. It will instead retard the construction of the large thermal-electric plants near the load centers of the region, and it is these large thermal plants that hold the best prospects for reducing power costs.

Fourth, the Interior Department used a 100-year payoff for the project instead of the usual 50 years. In actual fact the project may be obsolete before it is built and the output of the Federal power project may not be marketable due to its high cost.

Fifth, the electric companies of the region have offered concrete alternatives for the production of equivalent power at less cost, without spending a dime of Federal money. Thus, the project does not meet the basic criteria of the Congress that there be no better alternate.

Sixth; it is virtually a pure power project, with less than 5 percent recreational and flood control benefits, for a region that has no power shortage.

Seventh, as the largest project moneywise in the omnibus bill, it was narrowly approved by the entire Public Works Committee.

The Interior Department spokesman says there "are too many imponderables involved to give a precise reply" on the power.

The Department's July report to President Johnson discussed power costs this way:

> It does not contend that the project will provide power locally at such a low rate as to act as a magnet to industry.

The report went on:

> In the early years more of the power would be used in the Boston area.

I say to you ladies and gentlemen, the President has recently signed the Public Works and Economic Development Act, which provides a legal framework and funds for regional commissions like the Appalachia Commission, which will undoubtedly recommend extensive Federal regional development programs. I am certain the people of New England would benefit more from $300 million of these types of projects—roads, medical facilities, timber development, and perhaps water supply—than from the Dickey project. I intend to support all the other projects, but I cannot in good conscience sit here and allow this project to go through without stating my views.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Can the gentleman give me a figure on the overall cost of this project?

Mr. CLARK. The cost, from this bill, is $227 million. There will be $80 million for transmission lines, which will make the project more than $300 million.

Mr. DADDARIO. The reason I ask that is in Connecticut we have a nuclear project underway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CLARK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DADDARIO. We have a nuclear project in Connecticut at the moment which is costing some $127 million, which will combine with a fossil fuel program and which I understand will have a 5-mill cost. Can the gentleman go into that?

Mr. CLARK. I went into that earlier, I will say to the gentleman. The Yankee atomic plant received a $5 million Federal grant for research and development, all of which went to Westinghouse Electrict Co. In addition it had an interest-free use of fuel for 5 years, which amounted to a subsidy of $3.9 million. It is now operating entirely independently of the Government and naturally paying itself. Its output is in excess of what the St. Johns project will be able to support in 1972.

Mr. DADDARIO. And it will be, the Connecticut project, completed when?

Mr. CLARK. The project has a 100-year payoff.

Mr. DADDARIO. The Connecticut project will be completed much prior to the 1971 date, as I understand it.

Mr. CLARK. That is true.

Mr. DADDARIO. And at a lesser cost.

Mr. CLARK. And at much less cost.

Mr. DADDARIO. As I understand it, it provides power at under 5 mills and will produce electricity for use throughout the whole New England area.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, normally I have not been an advocate of public power as such. Nor has the Public Works Committee characteristically advocated public power where private investor-owned companies were capable of providing the needs.

A few years ago, in the Tennessee Valley bonding bill, the committee with my individual concurrence provided clearly that any expansion of generating capacity in the TVA area must stop at the limits of its present service region. We were extremely careful to make certain that there be no invasion of those areas now served by private power.

Just this year, in both the Appalachian bill and the Economic Development bill, the committee with my active help inserted language to guarantee that no funds could be used to develop any public power whatever in competition with the existing private power sources.

In considering the present bill, the committee rejected certain proposals which would have developed water resources in various parts of the country primarily for the public production of power.

In the St. John River project, however, we have a unique and impelling situation.

The one great roadblock which lies across the trail to commercial and industrial progress in New England is the extremely high price of electric power throughout that region.

The single most effective thing we can do to assist in the development of New England is to make it possible for New England citizens and businesses to purchase electric energy at rates more nearly in keeping with those the rest of us pay throughout the country.

As serious as any water crisis in New England is the electric supply in the area. It is a severe handicap to the area. New Englanders today are required to pay about 20 percent more for their electricity than are the citizens elsewhere in this Nation.

The 1963 census of manufacturers published by the Bureau of the Census concluded that power purchased by New England industries in 1962 cost those industries approximately 66 percent more than the average U.S. industrial rate. Transplanted into dollars, this means that New England industries would have saved $72 million that year had they been able to acquire electricity at the average U.S. rate.

The present project is designed to help equalize that appalling handicap. It has been carefully studied by both the Corps of Army Engineers and the Public Works Committee. On the basis of studious analysis, we have concluded that the project is highly feasible and economically well-justified. The two sites on the river, the Dickey Dam and the downstream Lincoln Regulating Dam, would provide a combined supply of approximately 800,000 kilowatts to produce more than 1 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity annually.

By the terms of this project, this high load factor energy could be sold for as little as 7 mills per kilowatt-hour and still easily pay off the project. This would be only a little more than half the present average of 13 mills per kilowatt-hour which New England electric consumers are paying today for their wholesale energy.

Peaking power would be sold for $15 per kilowatt a year as compared with the present going rate of $23.50 per kilowatt a year which the Federal Power Commission estimates as the cost of the most modern New England plants.

The opponents of this project are the New England power companies—the same companies which charge their consumers the highest rates for electricity in the Nation. These are the companies which Chairman Joseph Swidler, of the FPC, chastised when he noted that:

New England is still an undeveloped power market * * * not since 1953 has a generating unit installed in New England been included among the first 20 in the Nation in efficiency.

Even under the rigorous standards of a 3¼-percent interest rate and a 50 year payout period with interest payments during construction, this project shows a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.8. In other words, according to the very conservative criteria used by the Corps of Army Engineers, this project will pay $1.80 in measurable benefits for each dollar of cost during every year of its existence.

This project has been attacked as being primarily one for the purpose of generating hydroelectric power. To a considerable degree, it is this. But this also means that the project will be almost 100 percent reimbursable with interest. And certainly nobody can say that any project in this Nation which will store 8 million acre-feet of badly needed water will serve no other purpose beyond power.

New England has been too long denied. This great and historic section of our Nation has waited patiently while the problems of other regions of our country have been assaulted. Members of Congress from New England have assisted the Western States through reclamation programs, have assisted the South and Midwest through agricultural programs, have assisted Appalachia through our bill earlier this year, have assisted the Atlantic and Gulf and Pacific Coast States through hurricane protection and beach erosion works.

The time has come for the rest of us to put aside whatever parochial reservations we may have, and assist New England with the solution of this critical problem through the enactment of this bill which is supported by a preponderate number of the Governors from New England and members of this committee and by each member of the delegation from the State of Maine.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement, and I want to expand this much on it. In that connection it was brought out very well in our hearings that the private power companies, when they talk about cheaper cost of developing electric energy, are not talking about cheaper cost to the consumer but they are talking about some relatively cheaper cost to the producing company. The cost to the consumer they would not predict as being cheaper. I would bring to the attention of the Committee that on the specific question of asking the private power companies an estimate of how much reduction in the price of power they would make to the consumer, they would make no response. So, so far as the consumer in New England is concerned, his condition will remain the same. They are at the mercy of the private power companies. I think we should follow the recommendation of this committee and bring in this new wonderful development on the St. John River.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill, but I am going to support the amendment striking out this specific project in Maine.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the St. John River in Maine which is part of the omnibus public works bill, S. 2300.

I base my opposition on these points. This project, despite its ultimate cost of more than $300 million, received scant examination by the Senate and that body did not hold public hearings.

The House Public Works Subcommittee held hearings of only two days.

I think it is important that the members bear in mind that this project will not achieve its stated goal of helping to reduce the cost of the power in the New England area. In fact, it will hold back the construction of large thermal-electric plants near the load centers of the region. It is these plants that hold the best prospect for reducing power costs. Furthermore, the electric companies of the region have offered concrete alternatives for the production of equivalent power at less cost without the use of Federal money. This violates what has been a basic criteria of the Congress for many years regarding public power projects—there is no better alternative under free enterprise. For example, the great TVA was created because private capital was unable to do the job.

The Secretary of the Interior had admitted that the private companies in the region have not been consulted on the need for this project. But what is most astounding is that the Department of the Interior has made no plans for selling the electricity the two proposed powerplants would produce. Secretary Udall told the Flood Control Subcommittee, "We'll plan this after the project is authorized."

Also let me point out that the Department of the Interior used 100-year payoff for the project instead of the customary 50 years. There is also the possibility the project may be obsolete before it is completed, and the output may not be marketable due to its high cost.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. TUPPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

At the outset I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. JONES] for his demonstrated concern for the northern New England area, in the face of determined opposition by special interest groups. There has been a most formidable array of forces alined against this project. In the 5 years I have been in Congress I have never seen a greater lobbying effort against an individual project. The opposition has been most intensive.

It is an undisputed fact that Maine is the principal beneficiary of this project. Maine is larger in size than the rest of New England. I appeal to you today on behalf of my State and its people.

I have been in public service for the major part of my adult life. During this time I have spoken in behalf of a great many measures before the State legislature and Congress designed to assist Maine; of all these proposals none have offered the potential that this project does for helping my State grow and prosper.

The State of Maine has the highest power rates in the Nation. This has placed an intolerable burden on Maine families and has seriously hampered our industrial effort. As a matter of fact it is the principal reason why Maine's chief export is its young men.

Some of my friends raise the time-worn argument that public power is bad per se, inasmuch as the private power companies should do the job. The answer to this shortsighted argument—in my State—is that private power interests have certainly had enough time to do the job and they have failed. Their promises are rather late.

These very same private power interests now opposing this bill have too long strangled the economic growth of my State.

It is alleged that atomic power development will make hydroelectric projects such as this obsolete. Yet the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Interior do not agree with this conclusion.

By 1980 there will be a requirement of 36 million kilowatts in the Northeastern part of North America, of which 4 million kilowatts will be needed for peaking purposes. The State of Maine alone will require 1,750,000 kilowatts. The Dickey-Lincoln School project could prove to be a valuable source of supply for this purpose at that time—even with atomic development.

It is estimated that firm energy can be delivered to Maine customers for 7 to 8 mills per kilowatt-hour compared with present charges ranging up to 20 mills, and peaking energy will be available at 3 mills per kilowatt-hour.

It seems significant to me that this project has the support of the President of the United States, of the entire Maine congressional delegation, of the Governor of Maine and all the other New England Governors, and the Government agencies involved. The Atomic Energy Commission has stated that this project will produce lower-cost power than a nuclear alternative.

In transmitting a report on this project to Speaker MCCORMACK, President Johnson said:

Authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln school project and the carrying forward of the other recommendations contained in the report is a highly important step in the future economic growth of the New England area.

The President went on to say that it would save New England power consumers over $9 million annually compared with present average costs, and more than $7 million each year compared with costs of alternative new sources of power supply.

I make no claim of knowing what the benefits may be for the rest of New Eng-

land, although it seems probable that northern New England—Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—will benefit the most—and certainly Maine will benefit the most.

Maine is a great State and I do not think it detracts from its many attributes to state it is not the influential State it once was.

There was a time when Maine had 10 Members of this body. Today we have but two, my friend BILL HATHAWAY on the Democratic side of the aisle and myself on the Republican side. There was a time when Maine produced Speakers of the House, a Vice President of the United States, and a nominee for President. These days are long past.

With the failure of our population to grow at the rate of most other States, our influence waned. The largest single factor responsible for the lack of stable full-time job opportunities has been the tremendously high power rate structure.

Since coming to Congress in 1961, I have supported public works projects in other States without exception, because I relied upon the individual to know what was necessary and feasible for his own State. I hope that Members will reciprocate today in helping the State of Maine.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. BALDWIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, there was a reference made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] or the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] in their colloquy as to whether or not there were actually facts brought out at the hearing relative to proposing a reduction of rates in the New England area if the power needs of that area continue to be provided by private enterprise in the form of investor-owned public utilities.

Mr. Chairman, we requested during the hearings that testimony be submitted to the committee on this issue, and on page 536 of the printed hearings appears the testimony submitted to us by the investor-owned private power companies in New England, stating that by 1980 they intended to reduce the power rates in that area by 40 percent and they intended to do so through nuclear plants.

Since the hearings I have before me a clipping from one of the newspapers in New England of September 8 announcing a contract for a nuclear energy plant awarded by three of the Vestal private utility companies in New England, a contract for $65 million to the General Electric Co. to build a nuclear energy plant in Connecticut, which would produce 600,000 kilowatts.

May I point out that if the $65 million contract for a nuclear energy plant is going to be constructed they will produce 600,000 kilowatts. The proposed public power project proposed in this bill at a cost of a total of $300 million, counting the transmission lines, would produce only 794,000 kilowatts. Therefore, this nuclear energy plant would produce almost an equivalent and cost one-fourth of the amount of the estimated cost of the public power facilities that would be proposed by the bill now before us. Therefore, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I do not see any reason why the taxpayers of our respective congressional districts should be burdened with a $300 million cost when we have testimony before our committee that the private utilities of the area are meeting the power needs through the letting of a contract for a nuclear energy plant. Our best estimates are they can produce power that will be even lower in estimate made by the Department of the Interior.

For this reason I am in full support of the amendment. In view of the anticipated large deficit in our budget this year I see no reason why we should spend this large amount of money up there.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I want to say I agree with the gentleman's statement. I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I fully agree with the statements of the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], to the effect that private interests are ready, willing, and able to take care of the foreseeable power needs of New England and that there is no need for the authorization of this project.

Particularly in Connecticut is this the case, where our companies have not only established atomic-powered plants to produce electric energy, but have joined with other out-of-State power producers to create the larger operating unit which will be necessary to provide the technology, the volume and the lower cost power that the future will require.

One other fact has not been mentioned and that is that the cost of operation of these private companies involves the payment of taxes and the contribution of interest by the companies which are also paying dividends to thousands of stockholders throughout the area.

Finally, one might ask whether it is logical at this time of enormous public expenditures, in a bill which spends $1.9 billion and in the face of sharply mounting costs of carrying on the war effort in Vietnam that we should tack another $300 million on to the taxpayers' bill.

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

(Mr. HATHAWAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am concerned that the Dickey-Lincoln School project be approved. This project is located in my district and of course would benefit my people considerably. It goes without saying that the construction alone would create welcome jobs, income, and opportunity for many of the residents of Maine. But the construction of this project would mean more than simply the creation of onsite benefits. Materials from every portion of the country would be utilized. In the construction of the Trinity Dam in California, for example, tractors and conveyors came from Illinois, trucks from Indiana and Pennsylvania, steel from Ohio, generators from New York, cranes, shovels, and draglines from Wisconsin—plus a myriad of products produced under contract or subcontract in many other States. The same was true of Glen Canyon in Arizona, of Hungry Horse in Montana, of Hartwell on the Savannah River—and it will be equally true of Dickey-Lincoln School in Maine. While this house approves construction of a project for Maine, it is also approving it for all America. In addition to the widespread benefits resulting from the construction the finished product will also be national in scope because it will help fulfill our objective to reduce power costs throughout the Nation and bring to every corner of our country a stimulus for greater economic growth. In every area where the Federal Government has constructed hydroelectric projects the private as well as the public utilities have prospered, low-cost power has increased the demand for power from every source. The creation of jobs, income, and opportunity have been the direct result of water resource development in the Northwest, the Southwest, and the Southeast. We can justifiably expect the same for this project in the Northeast, an area far from the coal, oil, and gas resources of the Nation, where power rates are the highest in the country, and where water is the prime natural resource for power.

Coal, oil, and gas once burned are gone forever. Nor is it enough to say that we might replace them with nuclear energy. Grave problems of waste disposal, unresolved questions concerning possible risk to public health, and high costs, all obscure the extent to which the country will convert to nuclear power. I trust these problems will be solved, and I am confident that the cost of nuclear fuels will be reduced, but hydroelectric generators may well remain our best source of power, because falling water is free.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project is an integral part of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill for water resource development throughout the country. It is no more equitable to strike this project than to strike any of the other 143 projects in this bill. The entire parcel has been carefully considered by the Public Works Committee and that committee in presenting this bill is presenting us with an answer to a national problem. Like the elementary and secondary education bill, the Higher Education Act, the omnibus housing bill, and the omnibus farm bill and many other pieces of legislation which we have passed at this session, this omnibus rivers and harbors bill is national in scope and should be

kept intact in order to accomplish its objective of providing nationwide water resource development.

Over 60 years ago Senator J. H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire, rose to voice his support of the Reclamation Act of 1902. His support was based, he said, on the fact that development of the West would add to the development of the entire Nation. Since 1902 water resource development west of the Mississippi has totaled $11.2 billion. In the Southeast the Federal investment has totaled $5.5 billion. In New England, however, water resource development investment has been only $413 million. The authorization of this project will make the total investment since 1902 still less than $1 billion but it will be a giant step toward providing low-cost power to every part of our Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I commend our distinguished colleague on the fine statement he is making, and I commend him for the hard fight and the hard work he has put into this matter. The development of the resources of the State of Maine is important to all the country, and I think most of the country will support the gentleman in the advocacy of this project.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my remarks let me simply say this.

If the residents on one side of Main Street in your home town were paying $10 a month for power while the people on the other side of the street were paying $30 a month for power you would think it was ridiculous. In this day and age it is just as ridiculous for the people of Portland, Oreg., to be paying less than one-half the amount for electricity than the people of Portland, Maine, are currently charged.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes had it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CLARK and Mr. BLATNIK.

The Committee divided.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote by tellers, the ayes are 100, noes 99.

The Chair votes in the negative.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] what the leadership's plans in regard to the pending bill are. We on this side are prepared to act on the bill today, if possible. I understand now that it may be put over until tomorrow. The membership would like to know.

Mr. BLATNIK. There are some engagements which a number of the Members of the House are committed or obligated to attend this evening. It is my understanding that the leadership on both sides strongly endorse the proposal that the Committee rise around 6 o'clock. So if the gentleman has no objection, I am prepared to make a motion that the Committee now do rise, and we shall return at noon tomorrow.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it proper for the Chair to make a tie or to break a tie, from a parliamentary standpoint, on a teller vote?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules, the Chair can vote to make or break a tie, the Chair informs the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. That was my recollection. I believe I lost an amendment that way a couple of years ago. I wanted to make sure, for the record

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I should like to ask the Chairman if we are going to continue tonight or not. I should think, in view of what has transpired in the last couple of weeks, we should go ahead and finish our business. We have been inconvenienced many times. Let us keep on doing it.

Mr. BLATNIK. We are prepared—I certainly am; and, in fact, all of the Committee Members are—to go ahead, but I believe in all fairness to Members who, by coincidence, have a serious conflict with obligations, we should not. Let me make the statement that I am prepared to move that the Committee rise now. I shall not at this moment. I believe we are over the hump. There are probably four amendments of any substance left.

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the gentleman, so far as I am concerned we are here. We are prepared to go ahead and finish the bill. There seems to be a great demand for these bills at this time. We have an opportunity to finish this bill today. So far as I am concerned, I have had a number of requests on this side that we finish the bill today. If the gentleman wishes, so far as we are concerned, we are ready to go ahead and finish it.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. CRAMER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 130, noes 72.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just under discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 313 I answered to my name on the first call and then left the Chamber. I have examined the RECORD and find I was not recorded. Since I did answer the call and did vote "aye," I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, on September 17 I was absent due to official business, the dedication of the Shenango Valley Dam in Mercer County, Pa. Consequently I missed rollcall No. 307. If I had been present, I would have voted "no."

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I just noted that on rollcall No. 262 on September 7, 1965, I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CHRYSLER CORP. ANNOUNCES PRICE INCREASES FOR 1966 MODELS

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in today's newspapers the Chrysler Corp. has announced its new price schedule for the 1966 models. By coincidence, which I consider more planned than strange, the increase is just about equal to the amount of the excise tax reduction which was voted by this Congress several months ago.

The explanation of the corporation is that this added price includes the cost of safety devices. When these safety devices are installed on all the automobiles produced by the manufacturer, the actual cost to the company will be about $22 to $24 per car. It looks as though the manufacturers contemplate an extra profit of $45 to $70 per automobile. If all of the other manufacturers agree to

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Sept. 23, 1965
For actions of Sept. 22, 1965
89th-1st; No. 175

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....10
Debt level.....9
Education.....22
Electrification.....8
Exhibitions.....4,12
Fabrics.....7
Feed grains.....17
Flood control.....3
Foreign affairs.....23
Foreign aid.....10
Foreign trade.4,7,12,17,24
Hardwoods.....7
National parks.....11
Patents.....21
Peace Corps.....16
Pesticides.....20
Poverty.....1
Research.....20
Rivers and harbors.....3
Roads.....6
Stockpiling.....13
Sugar.....2,14
Tariffs.....24
Trade fairs.....4,12
Trading stamps.....19
Veterans' affairs.....18
Water conservation.....25
Watersheds.....5,15

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on poverty bill. Rep. Findley criticized sugar program. Senate debated foreign aid appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. POVERTY. Received the conference report on H. R. 8283, to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act (H. Rept. 1061), which the House is to act upon today. pp. 23784-8, D953

2. SUGAR. Rep. Findley criticized the sugar program and particularly the sugar bill, H. R. 11135. pp. 23800-3, 23805-7

3. RIVERS AND HARBORS; FLOOD CONTROL. Passed with amendments S. 2300, the rivers-and-harbors and flood-control bill. pp. 23762-84

4. EXHIBITIONS. Passed without amendment H. R. 9247, to provide for U. S. participation in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex. pp. 23788-93

Passed, 254-113, as reported H. R. 30, to provide for U. S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla. pp. 23788-9, 23793-800

5. WATERSHEDS. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved various watershed-project reports for full committee action. p. D953

6. ROADS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment S. 2084, to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems (H. Rept. 1084). p. 23832

7. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Schmidhauser spoke on "Iowa's stake in the export trade." pp. 23821-4

The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7723, to suspend the tariff on importation of certain tropical hardwoods (H. Rept. 1075). p. 23832

The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11029, amended, relating to tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics of vegetable fibers, except cotton. p. D954

8. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Ottinger inserted and commended an article, "Why Not Bury Powerlines?" pp. 23826-8

9. DEBT LEVEL. Rep. Curtis expressed concern about the debt level in our economy and inserted an article, "Liquidity and Debt." pp. 23815-19

SENATE

10. FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 10871. pp. 23908-9

11. NATIONAL PARKS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9417, to revise the boundary of Jewel Cave National Monument, S. Dak. (S. Rept. 766). p. 23836

12. TRADE FAIRS. The Foreign Relations Committee reported with amendment S. 2167, to provide for U. S. participation in the HemisFair 1968 exposition in San Antonio, Tex. (S. Rept. 767). p. 23836

13. STOCKPILING. A subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 6852 (amended), to authorize disposal of about 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile without the 6-month waiting period; H. R. 10516, to authorize the disposal of vegetable tannin extracts from the national stockpile; H. R. 10714, to authorize the disposal of colemanite from the supplemental stockpile; and H. R. 10715, to authorize the disposal of chemical grade chronite from the supplemental stockpile. p. D951

14. SUGAR. The "Daily Digest" states that the Finance Committee announced that it would "hold hearings on Tuesday and Wednesday, September 28 and 29, on H. R. 11135, to extend the Sugar Act, if this bill has passed the House by that date." p. D951

15. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement on the following watersheds: Zeigler Creek, Nebr.; Elko, Nev.; Swan Quarter, N. C.; Frogville Creek, Okla.; and Chocolate, Little Chocolate, and Lynn Bayou, Tex.; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Bayou Boeuf, Mauch Chunk Creek, Pa.; Middle Creek, Pa.; to Public Works Committee. pp. 23835-36

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1965 No. 175

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: Psalms 95:2: *Let us come into His presence with thanksgiving.*

Almighty God, during the hours of the new day, may we be aware of Thy presence, filling our minds and hearts with Thy peace and power and may Thy love always be with us to guard and guide us in the ways which are well pleasing unto Thee.

May we feel how solemn and wonderful it is to live daily under Thy kind and beneficent providence which will never leave us uncared for and unprotected and unnourished.

Grant that our whole life may be a pursuit of the best not only for ourselves but especially also for the needy members of the human family who may be finding the struggle of life so very difficult.

In these strange times when confused cries are echoing through the world, may we hear and heed Thy voice proclaiming the eternal values and bidding us to be strong and steadfast in the faith.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2414. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9221) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 8, 10, 24, 62.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8715) entitled "An act to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10323) entitled "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1357. An act to revise existing bail practices in courts of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies; and

S. 1826. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, I was necessarily absent because of a death in my family and I missed certain rollcall votes. I would like to have the RECORD indicate my position on each of these issues. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

H.R. 8439, motion to table previous motion on H.R. 8439, rollcall No. 262: "Yea."

H.R. 10775, rollcall No. 263: "Yea."

H.R. 168, rollcall No. 264: "Yea."

Senate Joint Resolution 102, rollcall No. 265: "Yea."

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 281 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have some family responsibilities from time to time. On Monday last I found it necessary to take a daughter to college in the Speaker's State. As a result thereof, I missed rollcalls 309 and 310.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have voted "yea" in each instance.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the RECORD to so indicate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 314]

Anderson, Ill.	Ashley	Brock
Andrews, George W.	Ayres	Burton, Utah
	Bolton	Colmer
Andrews, Glenn	Bonner	Dickinson
	Bow	Diggs

Dow	Johnson, Okla.	Scott
Farnsley	Lindsay	Senner
Fino	McEwen	Springer
Foley	Martin, Ala.	Stephens
Frelinghuysen	Martin, Mass.	Stratton
Giaimo	Miller	Tenzer
Hanna	Moorhead	Thomas
Harris	O'Brien	Thompson, Tex.
Herlong	O'Hara, Ill.	Toll
Hicks	Passman	Watson
Holifield	Redlin	Willis
Holland	Resnick	
Hosmer	Roosevelt	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 378 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RIVERS, HARBORS, AND FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2300, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through title II of the committee substitute, ending on line 24, page 77.

Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NELSEN

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NELSEN: On page 68, after line 22 insert the following new section:

"SEC. 207. That the project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minnesota, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-500, 72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work done by such interests on such project after April 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized."

Renumber succeeding sections and reference thereto accordingly.

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] will give me his attention. I received a call from the Bureau of the Budget and it was called to my attention that the last several lines of my original amendment were objected to. However, the first part of it—the amendment that was discussed yesterday—was found to be satisfactory and a precedent did exist similar to it.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, in order to save time, the committee is fully familiar with the project about which the gentleman speaks, as the gentleman knows, and is most sympathetic.

Do we have it correctly understood that in the gentlemen's amendment he is dropping and deleting the originally proposed latter part which deals with the excess cost, in case of excess, of required local contributions and the Secretary of the Army be authorized to reimburse such local interests for all amounts in excess of such required contributions?

Do I understand the gentleman is deleting that language in his proposed amendment?

Mr. NELSEN. Yes; in keeping with the request of the Bureau of the Budget I have deleted this part. I hope the first part will cover it. I realize that it would be unwise to press for something unacceptable to the committee and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his concurrence in the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment as the gentleman presents it, which omits the point that had been giving us difficulties. The amendment is satisfactory and the committee agrees to it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Would the gentleman indicate what language is being stricken?

Mr. NELSEN. The language which appears in the middle of the paragraph beginning with "if the costs to local interests"—and then from there on strike the rest of the original amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman's request conforms then to the type of action our committee has taken in other instances in a similar situation and does not thus give preference to this project over other projects?

Mr. NELSEN. It is my understanding there is a precedent for this and I believe it is fully justified. I am sure there will be no objection in the Congress to later coming through with the necessary appropriations for the project.

Mr. CRAMER. I want to say to the gentleman that he made a most convincing presentation yesterday on the floor of the House. I consider this a most unique situation relative to this project and for that reason insofar as this side of the aisle is concerned we too accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of a district plagued by a persistent drought, I certainly hope that the Congress on ultimate passage will retain title I which deals with the problem of water supply in the northeastern part of our Nation. I urge my colleagues in this House as well as the other body not to abandon a vitally important section of our country to the vagaries of unpredictable nature.

As paradoxical as it may sound, the provision in the bill may at the same time solve the problem of the water shortage which is haunting us now and the problem of floods which has vexed us in the past.

By allowing the U.S. Army Engineers to plan for the construction, operation, and maintenance of major reservoirs by the United States, we will be taking a giant step forward in the age-old battle against the devastation of the elements.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BALDWIN

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN: Page 58, line 13, strike out "$133,548,000" and all that follows down through and including the period on line 2 of page 59, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$88,402,000, except that pump storage power development is not authorized to be constructed at such project."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make a modification in the project which is authorized on page 58 of the bill, called the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, W. Va. This would simply eliminate the authorization to build a public power facility as a portion of this project. The project is economically feasible without it. The flood control aspects and the construction of a flood control reservoir are economically feasible without the public power facility. This would simply strike that facility.

I think it is important to note that an application has been pending before the Federal Power Commission by a public utility in the area, the Monongahela Power Co., for a permit to construct a powerplant on this river in this general location. Not only has this application been pending before the Federal Power Commission but since our hearings in the last month the Federal Power Commission has issued an order. I hold a copy of it in my hand. This relates to the Monongahela Power Co. application and awards the company a 24-month preliminary permit to study the proposed 380,000 kilowatt pump storage project on this river in West Virginia.

Since the permit is not only pending for construction, but a preliminary permit has now been granted for the 24-month study, it seems to me it would be inappropriate for us at this time while the study is now authorized and in process to authorize the expenditure of $45 million of Federal funds for the construction of a public power facility that will not be necessary if this private powerplant is built.

In the Senate an amendment was approved which has the wording that appears in the House bill that states, and I read from the House bill:

Provided, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has

completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project:

The committee wording goes on with this further proviso:

Provided further, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further,* That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The language therefore goes ahead and approves now the Federal construction of a Federal power facility if the FPC does not grant an application for a private power facility. This would authorize a Federal power facility if the FPC does not act. I think we are prejudicing the case before the FPC if we approve a law today that gives definite approval to a public power facility if the FPC does not act favorably on the final construction permit.

It seems to me we should defer any such decision and give the FPC a clear right to make a ruling without having any legislation that says we automatically have authorized a Federal power facility if the FPC does not grant this private permit.

For this reason my motion would just strike out the Federal cost for Federal construction of the power facility and simply authorizes the other aspects of the project, including flood control. Incidentally, it would save $45 million which I am sure our Federal taxpayers would be very happy to have us say that we could save.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I arise to oppose this amendment.

The proposed authorization of this project has been criticized because it would provide authorization for Federal construction of the power features in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications. It is contended that no Federal authorization should be provided if private interests are taking active measures to construct the project.

In this connection, it is to be noted that the language in the present bill places no restriction in the way of private development other than the approval of the Federal Power Commission—a step required in the case of any project licensed by the Federal Power Commission. In fact, the act gives priority to the private developer and no consideration could be given to Federal construction of the power facilities unless and until the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending application. The Federal Power Commission has, in fact, granted a temporary permit to the Monongahela Power Co. to study private power development.

The bill would insure full comprehensive development of the Rowlesburg site, including construction of the power facilities by either a private developer under Federal Power Commission license, or if this is not done, by the Federal Government. There is no reason to delay Federal authorization at this time. If, for one reason or another, the power was not developed by a private developer there would be a subsequent delay in obtaining Federal authorization.

If the power facilities are not constructed concurrently with construction of the Federal dam and reservoir it will be necessary for the Government to include an intake and tunnel stub at a cost of $1½ million to permit the later addition of power either by the private developer or the Government. To avoid excessive costs, this must be done before the reservoir is filled. Such initial costs will be repaid by the private developer, but in all likelihood will be sunk costs and never recovered if the private developer should back out and there is no Federal authorization for power construction. The Government could insure recovery of these initial costs under the terms of the bill. If the private developer is indeed sincere in making the application and is not making it primarily as a device to forestall the development of public power it is difficult to see how he can object to the inclusion of provisions for Federal authorization.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. In this project, if it is constructed, coal will be used, will it not, to produce electricity?

Mr. KEE. That is correct.

Mr. STAGGERS. And instead of electric energy produced solely by waterpower, we will use up at least 1 kilowatt of energy produced by coal for every kilowatt of energy obtained from the hydroelectric generators? The energy produced by coal will be used to pump the water about a thousand feet up hill to the reservoir for the hydroelectric generator?

Mr. KEE. That is correct.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to assure the gentleman in the well that I have been assured by the head of the utility company that proposes to build this project and that has made application to build it, that if the application is approved, 100 percent union coal will be used at the Rowlesburg plant.

Mr. KEE. That is correct.

Mr. STAGGERS. I just wanted to make it clear that by building the project, we will be using coal, the one thing that we have in abundance in the State of West Virginia, to produce the electricity and that by doing that we will be developing the whole area economically and we will be bringing in more industry and that we will be using our natural products and resources. Also it will be the first attack on poverty in a direct and positive way that we have ever had in our area.

Further I want to point out that this is the only major project I know of that has ever been proposed to be constructed in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. My colleague is correctly stating the situation.

Mr. STAGGERS. For that reason I want to be sure that this project is approved and the only way we can do it is by assuring that public power stands in the background in case this permit is not issued by the Public Power Commission and also if the utility is dilatory in constructing the facility once license has been granted. We want to be absolutely sure that West Virginia is not deprived of this vital project because of the failure or inability of private industry to act promptly.

Mr. KEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I think it should be pointed out to the committee that this project has a benefit cost ratio of 2.1 to 1. Let us examine the report and see if that is concurred in by the Federal agencies and the State. On page 40 of the report, the statement is made as follows:

COMMENTS OF THE STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of West Virginia: Favorable.

Therefore, we see that all these State and Federal agencies and the State of West Virginia are in favor of this project that is being discussed here today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Very briefly, I am hopeful that we can get to final consideration of these amendments to the bill this afternoon.

The gentleman from California has very clearly explained why he feels that unless this amendment is adopted that the Federal Power Commission, which presently has issued a preliminary license to the private enterprise development, is likely, on final consideration to be prejudiced by the action of this Congress in authorizing the project as a possible function at taxpayers' expense. I agree with the gentleman from California wholeheartedly.

I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is a most reasonable one. It is most reasonable considering the circumstances of the consideration which will be given, according to the majority's report on S. 2300, next year, on an annual basis, of these omnibus bills. By that time, the Federal Power Commission will have had a reasonable opportunity to act. There will be no delay in the matter, and the matter can be considered next year.

I refer to page 2 of the committee report, where the following statement appears:

The committee intends to report an omnibus bill every year hereafter rather than every 2 to 4 years.

So I suggest that the question will be considered on its merits by the Federal Power Commission, construction will not be prejudiced, and the taxpayers' burden of paying the cost will not be prejudiced.

Under those circumstances, it is logical and reasonable to agree to the amendment. The gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] sat through and heard all the hearings on this subject. His amendment would give the Commission an opportunity to act on the private development aspects, which it already has done preliminarily.

I understand that there is some argument that perhaps private enterprise will not push it hard enough. It seems to me that private enterprise has pushed it hard enough to get a preliminary license, and, it seems to me, they have shown good faith and intent to go ahead with the project. I cannot undertsand why our committee insists on prejudicing the private development of that power by inserting in the bill proposed language which indicates that if they do not act on the project, then the Congress will authorize a public project. That is not the way to do it. I do not want the Federal Power Commission so prejudiced. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Congress, my colleague from California, my good friend and colleague from Florida and I are not necessarily in disagreement on this issue. It is highly important to me—and to my State—that this project be undertaken, and I want insurance that it will be undertaken. As the gentlemen know, and as the Congress knows, the proposal here is only an authorization. If the private power company goes ahead—and I know they will go ahead, unless some unforseen circumstances intervenes—there will be no question that the project will be built and operated by the private power company. I can see no harm in authorizing it. The House committee saw no harm in authorizing it after prolonged debate.

I remember that before final conclusion was reached, a preliminary permit to the utility company had been brought to the attention of the House committee.

Many things might happen in the next year or two, when the project should be in process of construction. Then, if the private power company does not built it, and this public construction provision is eliminated from the bill, we would have to come back here and ask again for authorization for public construction, thus delaying action for an unreasonable time.

If this project is authorized, as submitted, there will never be any money appropriated. There will never be a request for it.

As to the fears of my friend from Florida, that if the bill passes as now written, the Federal Power Commission will never grant permission for private construction, let me assure the gentleman and the Congress that I will unreservedly support any reasonable measure designed to secure FPC permission for private construction. I want to have the assurance that public power is going to stand in the background. The Senate wanted it that way, and our committee voted it out that way.

As I said, this is the first major project which has ever been proposed to be constructed in the State of West Virginia. Certainly, at this time I do not want to jeopardize it. It will mean much to our people. It will be a direct attack on poverty. It will be one which will consume our natural products, bring in industry, and create jobs right in the center of our State.

The dam in itself is a good thing, but will do only half the job. The power-generating project will do the other half.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We on the committee know the great interest the gentleman from West Virginia has taken in this project. If the Baldwin amendment were to prevail it would prejudice the development of the project, since the scheme provides that the Federal Government can continue to make plans for the complete project and not segment it by having the Federal Government do a part of the job and the private utility the other. If the Baldwin amendment is adopted, it will erase the opportunity of the Federal Government to prosecute this project.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true. I appreciate the contribution of the capable and distinguished gentleman from Alabama, who presided during the hearings on this project, and who ruled with consistent fairness and understanding of the issues involved.

I might say that construction economies should be considered in this project. If the powerplant is to be a part of the project, either private or public power, a tunnel and a tower must be made a part of the dam. These should be incorporated in the body of the dam itself, and not added as an afterthought at greater expense.

If the private power company takes over they will pay the cost. If they do not, the Federal Government will assume it. They will pay for it as it is constructed.

I hope the committee in its wisdom will keep this provision in the bill. I assure those men who come from coal-producing States that not one kilowatt of electricity will be produced, except by coal, because this will be a pumped storage station. The water will be pumped to the top of the mountain and brought back down through chutes and tunnels to produce electricity. Pumping will be done at night, when the load on the generators is light; the hydroelectric generators will be operated during the day, when demand is at the peak. This will even out total demand over the full 24 hours.

I have been assured by the head of the utility that it will use union coal, and it will use our most plentiful natural resource.

I want to be sure that this project will be completed in full, not only the water control dam, but the appended powerplant. It is a project vital to the economic health of West Virginia. And I am convinced that the bill as written is the only way to assure its completion.

I say again I do not believe my good friend from California and my friend from Florida disagree with me as to what should be done; it is only a matter of approach.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. JONES of Alabama.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to this section?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARK: Substitute the following language for the language on page 41, lines 4 through 12, inclusively:

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the Saint John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project, which survey shall include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy, and to submit a report thereon to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will state his point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This amendment had been considered and was subject to amendment under the previous amendment offered to strike this project.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The Chair will inform the gentleman from Alabama that the purpose of this amendment is to insert something other than that which was taken into consideration yesterday. So the point of order against this amendment is overruled.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CLARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this is practically the same as that which was offered yesterday as far as the St. John River project is concerned. In this amendment the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the St. John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy tidal project, which survey shall include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, includ-

ing thermal power development using nuclear energy, and to submit a report thereon to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966.

I have offered this amendment for the following reasons. In the New England area we now have thermonuclear power. If this amendment is defeated we will have a $300 million water project using nothing but water. The thermonuclear powerplant in Connecticut which, of course, will be and is completely different from what is in this bill, uses today many, many thousands of tons of coal. So I ask your consideration today to strike out on page 41 lines 4 to 12 inclusive for this purpose.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to be in opposition to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I recognize and respect his feelings with respect to this matter. He comes from a coal producing area. Members from some of those coal producing areas have found it desirable in some cases to oppose this project, I suppose upon the theory that the existing private power facilities in New England use coal and that a hydropower facility would be able to produce cheaper power than could be produced by coal.

However, just to authorize another survey of a project that has been studied for more than 30 years would be only to postpone the day of inevitable reckoning. This is not a solution.

The committee has thoroughly, carefully, and painstakingly heard both proponents and opponents. They have studied this project. Unlike most power projects, this one seems particularly warranted because of the great roadblock which lies across the trail of development for New England. This roadblock is the high price of power. New England industries pay 66 percent more for their power than do the average industries throughout the country. This is a terrible handicap to that area.

This project is the only opportunity we will have in this bill to make a meaningful, substantial contribution to the economic development of that historic section of our country which is New England. They have helped us on our projects. New England Congressmen have assisted the westerners in reclamation projects; they have assisted the southwesterners and the southerners and the midwesterners in our agricultural programs. They have assisted the west coast and the east coast and the gulf coast areas in beach erosion and hurricane protection projects. This is all they have asked for. This is their great need, for some measure of power at a price that people can pay.

Mr. Chairman, the average consumer in New England is required to pay 20 percent more for electric energy than is the case throughout the rest of the country.

Mr. Chairman, we faced this issue yesterday and there was admittedly a close vote. Normally I am not an advocate of public power, but in this instance where Chairman Joseph Swidler, of the Federal Power Commission, found it necessary to chastise the private power interests in New England for not having produced modern, efficient, electric power generating capacity, where there have been years and years of study, years and years of opportunity for those private companies to come in and provide this demonstrable need for the people of New England and they have not done it, I see no justice in postponing the day of reckoning and putting it off and calling for another study. We have had study on top of study, ad infinitum, and there has been no action.

It is time for us to take a stand. I am going to stand today with New England because I think they have been too long denied.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I remained silent yesterday while the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to delete the Lincoln-Dickey part of the Passamaquoddy project was under consideration. I remained silent yesterday, but today I cannot remain silent. Misstatement of fact and distortion of motive have been too great. First of all, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] has blithely said he can see no reason why we oppose this. I want to remind the members of the Committee that in the full Committee on Public Works, and surely all of the people of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union are entitled to know this, the vote for this project was 18 to 15, and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], joined with us, who felt this project is not justified on the facts and evidence which we have had before us.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has misinformed the Members of the Committee of the Whole when he said that this project has been studied for 30 long years. It is not true, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. Chairman, Passamaquoddy was studied for 30 long years, and this project is only part of Passamaquoddy. At the last moment when the administrative agencies involved, even this administration, could not put their stamp of approval on Passamaquoddy, then they lopped off this part of Passamaquoddy—and not such a little part at that, $300 million worth of Passamaquoddy was lopped off, and here it is.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been full and complete public hearings held on this particular project, standing on its own two feet. These 30 years of hearings about which they talk have been the 30 years of hearings on the ill-fated Passamaquoddy project as a whole, of which this Lincoln-Dickey project is but one part. There has never been a true hearing on Lincoln-Dickey by itself. This was tacked on, on the floor of the other body without debate, without real discussion, and without hearings in the Senate, and came to our Public Works Committee.

Mr. Chairman, everyone knows how busy the Committee on Public Works has been lately with the Economic Development Act, the Highway Beautification Act, and other important matters. It came to our committee and there was never an opportunity to have full and complete hearings on it.

Mr. Chairman, it is not fair to say that this matter has been heard and reheard, studied and restudied. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania is leaning backward in fairness when he proposes that this Lincoln-Dickey project be given a study, with the directive that the study come back next March, no later than next March, so the House can work its will at that time in trying to be fair.

Mr. Chairman, for those on the majority side who are keenly aware of the importance of being of being fair in the legislative process, here is an amendment they can support in good faith, because this project has never been really studied before. Based on figures we are given here, the need for a study is real. There has been distortion of facts and figures that should stand the test of study.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point I want to mention in respect to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT]. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in New England, but I want to tell the gentleman from Texas that New Hampshire has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the entire United States—less than 2 percent. I think we people in New England are well qualified to make our own decision as to whether or not we want unnecessary public power which costs more than our own taxpayer utilities can produce it for.

Mr. Chairman, as welfare program after welfare program has marched through this House, again and again I have heard gentlemen from the other side of the aisle rise in righteous wrath and say, "Let us pass this legislation so that we will make taxpayers out of these tax eaters on the welfare rolls."

Well and truly said, Mr. Chairman, and I agree. But why now are they trying to downgrade and denigrate the taxpaying utility and put in its place a taxeating monstrosity. Costly, outdated, and inefficient, it makes no economic sense; it makes no sense at all. Let us be consistent, let us give the taxpayers of this country a break.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Is not one of the crux issues in this whole matter that the Secretary of the Interior desires to get this project through which is really the beginning of his effort to try to get a national grid system established in the northeastern United States under the control of the Federal Government, no matter what we have in the Northwest

and other places? Is that not the real issue behind this effort?

Mr. HARSHA. I think that is absolutely right.

Mr. CRAMER. It is true, may I ask the gentleman, that the Atomic Energy Commission indicated that a project that would be one-fifth of the cost of the proposed hydroelectric project could be built in New England, and I am reading from page 244 of the report on the bill.

Mr. HARSHA. I think that is right.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time we set the record straight on the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Dickey-Lincoln is a new quicky proposal that emerged as an expediency in order to open up New England for public power. It is a part of the much discredited international Passamaquoddy tidal project and is an indirect means of getting the unfeasible Passamaquoddy project approved, piecemeal. As a separate isolated power project, contrary to what my friend from Texas says, Dickey has neither been studied nor has it followed the procedures set forth by law for presentation of a project proposal for authorization by the Congress.

The 1944 Flood Control Act requires that project proposals be submitted to States and affected agencies for comment and review. As a separate project, the Dickey proposal was never submitted to the States and the agencies for review and comment. It was submitted as a combination of the Passamaquoddy project to be constructed and operated on an entirely different basis than the project now proposed, and no information has been presented to the States and the agencies for review and comment on this new basis. Is the Congress now to violate its own rules with respect to this particular project in authorizing a proposal which has not been studied on its own merits and which has not followed the statutory requirements. Not only have we failed to follow the statutory requirements, but this project is inconsistent with the basic philosophy of Federal power development.

One of the fundamentals of that philosophy as expressed in Senate Document No. 97 which is the bible, so to speak, for the procedure in approving these projects by the Corps of Engineers—that fundamental is that the proposal must be the cheapest and most effective alternative. The record is replete with evidence that this is not the cheapest and most effective alternative.

Now we have heard arguments that there is a great need for additional electricity in this New England region. The Federal Power Commission reports on electric power supply, as late as April 30 of this year, indicate a reserve of more than 25 percent in this area. This certainly refutes the argument that there is a shortage of power in that area.

Further, the argument has been advanced that this power will be cheap power and will cause industry to move into the area. This is just not so. The cost of power as an increment of product value, as shown by the 1960 annual survey of manufacturers conducted by the Census Bureau, averages only 0.84 percent of all manufacturing. I repeat, power averages less than 1 percent of the cost of production. The highest occurred in the chemicals and allied products industry which averaged only 2.4 percent and next were primary metals which averaged 1.9 percent. The relationship of power cost to product value has been going down over the years because of low power cost and the increasing prices of other materials. Power costs are actually insignificant in a decision to locate industry in a particular area. The primary considerations are labor and transportation costs in getting, not only raw materials to the plants, but in transporting processed products to and from the market.

And now as to whether or not this is cheap power, I would point out that Charles Robinson, engineer and counsel of the National Rural Electrification Association, who can hardly be classified as a private power exponent, says in his testimony before the Public Works Committee that the average of all power purchased in Maine is 13.9 mills and for Vermont 9.4 mills. He also says in his testimony that the annual cost of producing this power at Dickey-Lincoln would be $14.6 million. In order to obtain $14.6 million annually to meet the cost of production of this power, the power would have to be sold at 15½ mills.

Now this may be low cost power to you, gentlemen, but I submit that when it is about 2 to 6 mills above what is presently being charged, I fail to see how this will ever reduce power rates in that area. The people of Maine cannot afford this "cheap" power.

Nor can the U.S. taxpayer afford to finance this project to the tune of $300 million.

I urge this Committee to adopt this substitute and to uphold the statutory and procedural requirements of Congress. Let us give this project a hearing and study on its own merits.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Congress, I rise in opposition to the amendment submitted by our good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of our committee.

I want to say this particular project was heard a year ago in the Senate. There was no need for further hearings in the Senate. The hearings that were held on the House side were full hearings. We held hearings and we heard every witness who wanted to appear.

Certainly the project that was brought before our committee was a project that had been well studied. Our late President Kennedy asked for this project to be studied and our present President, President Johnson asked for the same.

This project is located on an international stream between the State of Maine and Canada. This particular project had met all of the criteria of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation and it had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Now I am sure that all projects come up in the same manner for consideration before our various committees. Serving on the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs and also on the Committee on Public Works, I know this to be a fact. You must receive the support of the agencies and they must meet the criteria laid down by the Congress. The projects must have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. This particular project had just that. Every witness was heard from.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did we not have the approval of the Governor of Maine, Gov. John H. Reed?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, Governor Reed came here and testified in support of this project as did both of their Members of Congress and I understand the like membership in the other body were in support of this project.

This particular dam is on the St. Johns River. It is going to utilize a resource—water—that is flowing down that river. It needs to be controlled on this side of the border and it needs to be controlled on the other side of the border. President Johnson made this request in the light that they would perfect an intertie in this particular area. We have just finished perfecting an intertie in the Pacific Northwest, the Southwest, and in the western part of the United States and the private utilities are going to be the biggest benefactors of that intertie. Certainly the private utilities in this area would have a very important benefit and part in this particular project. I am certain that if this is built, the utilities there would be brought into it as far as marketing the power and transmitting the power. If the intertie is perfected between the two countries, they would be a part of it.

In Canada there is also a need for river regulation and power generation.

I know that there is no low-cost power in the New England States. The power costs there are the highest of any place in the United States. This would be the first time that we had a Federal public development that would offer low-cost power to the people of Maine. We have had this fight throughout the United States. Wherever we have had one of these projects—and I cite the Missouri River Basin, TVA, the Bonneville project, the CVP project in the Central Valley of California, the Southeast and the Southwest power authorities—they are all working for the best interests of the people of the United States.

The private utilities are getting along very fine. They are taking from those projects a large proportion of the power and passing it on to other people as local consumers. Certainly when the people of Maine come down here in force and support this project that has been approved by all the Federal agencies—and it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget—I say that we should not set the project aside for further study. It has been studied. There is no need for further study. This project will pay itself out in 50 years with interest to the Federal Government, because 98 percent of it is power and that money will come back to the Federal Government, the same as with other great projects we

have approved across the Nation. All power facilities are reimbursable with interest.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from New Hampshire has given a rather impassioned plea, repeating the timeworn argument that the private power companies make against this very valuable project in my State of Maine.

Again, let me say that the people of the State of Maine need this project. They need it deseperately to lower the cost of power in our State. There are only two of us in the House of Representatives—my friend, BILL HATHAWAY on the Democratic side and myself on the Republican side—and I certainly hope that the Members will give Maine this assist today, so that we can help ourselves develop industry in our State.

I should like to tell the membership a little bit about what the private power companies in the State of Maine have done in the past: they have attempted to strangle industrial development in my State. I speak with some knowledge on this subject because I was once, as commissioner of fisheries in Maine, an ex officio member of the Maine Development Commission.

Gentlemen, guess who was in charge of the Maine Development Commission? Always one of the executives of one of the Maine power companies. In that sensitive position they were able to keep industry from our State, and allow industry to grow only as the power companies grew, and not vice versa.

Gentlemen, I appear here today to implore you to give us a hand with this project that is so badly needed. Our young men are leaving the State of Maine. I have a 23-year-old son who himself may have to leave the State of Maine in order to support his wife and his three children. Maine Representatives have given support to many projects in various sections of the Nation over past years. Today we ask that you reciprocate.

I notice that over $11 billion has been spent on these projects west of the Mississippi. Over $5.550 billion east of the Mississippi and south of the Mason-Dixon line has been spent. Yet in all of New England only $413 million has been spent, and out of that only $19,388,000 has been spent for the Pinetree State of Maine. I beg your consideration for the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. I would like to point out to the Committee certain testimony concerning this issue of power casts. Mr. Charles Robinson, the engineer and counsel of the Natural Rural Electrification Association, who can hardly be classified as a private power advocate, stated in his testimony before the Committee on Public Works that the average of all power purchased in Maine is purchased at a cost of 13.9 mills, and for Vermont it is 9.4 mills.

He also says in his testimony that the annual cost of producing this power at Dickey-Lincoln would be $14.6 million. In order to obtain $14.6 million annually to meet this cost of production, the power would have to be sold at 15½ mills. This may be low-cost power to some, but I submit that when it is about 2 to 6 mills above what is presently being charged I fail to see how such "cheap" power will ever reduce the power rates in that area. The reason the power rates now charged in New England are somewhat higher than other areas is the high cost of transportation of coal to the power facility. A contract has already been awarded to GE to construct a nuclear powerplant in Connecticut to serve this area which would provide much cheaper power, not only than coal but also much cheaper than this hydro project. High cost public power is not going to reduce the rates to New England. It just is not possible to sell the Dickey-Lincoln power at less than 15½ mills and recover the annual production costs of this power of some $14.6 million. The construction of this project will raise the costs of power to New Englanders rather than lower it.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct. The comments on that appear on pages 242, 243, and 244 of the supplemental views in the report on the legislation.

There is not any question that the power will be sold at a price in excess of the present power cost, according to the REA Chairman in that area, Mr. Robinson. So this cheap power argument does not hold water.

The House might as well be on notice. This is what will happen. Secretary Udall of the Department of the Interior wants to establish a grid system in the northeastern part of the United States. They have not been able to do so to date. This is where they want to start. The reason they have to start here is because this power cannot be sold in the area where it is produced. The majority report even says so. This power is going to be produced on the St. John River in Maine and sold elsewhere, because the users are not available in that area. That means the Federal Government will have to go into Federal power transmission, with the beginning of a grid system.

The Passamaquoddy project has never been, as a whole project, approved by any department or by any agency of the Federal Government, because it is so bad, because the cost is so high, and because the benefits are so little.

I have served on the Committee on Public Works for 11 years. I have never known of such a project being approved by the Congress of the United States. It is supposedly a multiple-purpose project. It is admitted by the majority report on the proposal that there is very little relationship to flood control.

Flood control is supposed to be and has traditionally been how we get into these things. Power is supposed to be secondary and incidental. We get into these multiple-purpose projects of flood control and power, but power is not the principal consideration. Flood control is how we get into these things.

How much of this is flood control? I ask Members to listen. How much? I have never seen a project with so little flood control on multiple-purpose usage. Here it is: Two-tenths of 1 percent. Two-tenths of 1 percent for flood control is to eventually cost the taxpayers of America $300 million because of the power features.

That is the only way we get into this project, yet it involves only two-tenths of 1 percent. Two percent of it is for what? It is for nothing relating to rivers and harbors or flood control, but it is rather a new gimmick brought into these projects to try to make them feasible—area redevelopment. It has nothing to do with the development of water resources in America.

For two-tenths of 1 percent for flood control we are asked to vote for nearly $300 million of Federal expenditures for something that is a power project, to provide power where it is not even needed.

The issue is simple. This is a project which is being taken out of order of usual flood control procedures. This is a project which has not conformed to the usual criteria of our committee. This is a project which has not been approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as a separate project. I will accept a challenge on that from anybody. This is a project which has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as a separate project.

This project came in as a part of the international Passamaquoddy tidal project. Passamaquoddy was such a bad project in total that when the report on it was submitted to the administration, as set forth to the Secretary of the Interior from the Passamaquoddy-St. John River Study Committee in 1964, it was so bad, they were so critical in their comments, and it was so accurately exposed as to fundamental refects in the plan, that construction of this project had to be abandoned. It was admittedly uneconomical.

They took one segment of it which has never gone through the Corps of Army Engineers and which has never gone through the procedures and the requirements of law. It has been brought up as a separate type of procedure, in order to try to force the beginning of Passamaquoddy and a national grid system. We cannot do that to the taxpayers of America to the tune of $300 million, for two-tenths of 1 percent flood-control protection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this project and against this amendment. This amendment is just a camouflage. There is not any sincere proposal that has been made to the committee to study an atomic energy plant in Maine. There has not been any such proposal before the committee at all. Any atomic energy plant that has been recommended, for example, before our committee has been some-

where in the lower part of New England. There has never been any contention that atomic energy plants could be or would be comparable to harnessing the St. John River in Maine.

Here is a river that has been flowing to the sea wasting its energy for all time. This is a great resource that renews itself constantly. It is a feasible project according to the historical standards of our committee. The Corps of Engineers testified that it had a favorable benefit-cost ratio. More than anything else they testified to the great need of the State of Maine for some low-cost power.

When this body is told that there will be low-cost power from the private power companies, they are not giving the real facts. The private power companies can and do boast that they will produce electric energy cheaper, but that is not what they are going to sell it for. They will sell it at as high a price as they can possibly get. That has been their history, and they will not change that history. I was one on the committee who asked for testimony from the private power companies. I was one of those on the committee who asked the private power companies what the price would be of their so-called cheap power for the people. Their spokesman said he would not tell us. He found out from others on the committee that the committee did not like that kind of an answer. So he went home and burned the midnight oil and came back with some figures which demonstrated that his company certainly and other companies in New England for whom he was speaking were not talking about reducing the rate for power even by 1980 to anything comparable to the Dickey project.

This Dickey project was testified to by Secretary Udall and others who represented that it would have power produced at 7 mills per kilowatt. That is what it would be sold for. Even with all of the reductions promised by the New England power companies as of 1980, they will only testify to an average reduction of about 9.7 mills. That will bring their power rates down to 14.5 mills from where it is now on an average of 24.2 mills.

For 30 years this river has been studied along with other projects in an attempt to relieve the State of Maine and the New England area from the onerous burden they carry of power rates. For pretty near all that time the State of Maine has suffered from an exodus of population. This is the kind of burden that we share in some areas in my part of the country in the West.

For these reasons I beg you to give attention to the problems of Maine by helping them to develop this great resource.

You know, a great deal is said about buying or selling coal to develop electric energy, but when you get all through mining it, you have ruined the resource. All you have is a hole in the ground that you have to tend to forever. Here is a river that is renewing itself constantly that will produce power cheaper for the consumer than any project testified to before the committee, whether it is public or private, in the New England area. I think that we are just dutybound to the people of the State of Maine to develop this cheap, low-cost energy for them so that they can develop other resources of their great country.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is discussing power rates. Could he tell us what the power rates would be in the Tennessee Valley if it were not for the TVA in the Southwest or Northwest if it were not for the great hydroelectric power developments in those areas and elsewhere in the country?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. We took testimony in the committee as to the great reductions that have occurred in power rates from our yardstick furnished by Bonneville, and our yardstick furnished by TVA, and those yardsticks furnished everywhere by public power. We found this was the thing that made the development of new resources and new industries possible in every other area of the United States.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I shall not take up much of your time. You heard my comments yesterday in favor of this project which would be located in my district. It is very interesting to hear the gentleman from New Hampshire say that he has only a 2-percent unemployment rate. I congratulate him on that.

In the State of Maine the unemployment rate is much higher. In the very area where this dam willl be located one-third of the families make less than $3,000 a year. As a matter of fact about half of the population of my district is located in area redevelopment areas.

The gentleman pointed out in the report the statement that the power rates would appear to be higher, if you average out figures, by about 2 mills. He says it will be 15.5 to 13.3, but he did not tell you that 80 percent of this power will be used as peaking power, at $15.50 per kilowatt-year for capacity and 3 mills for energy. That is at least 25 percent less than the nuclear alternative to produce the same power.

Under the marketing of this power the full amount of money will be repaid to the Federal Government so that in effect the $300 million, about which you have heard over and over again as going down the drain will not be going down the drain. The entire amount of money, with interest, will be returned.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in conclusion that I appreciate very much the comments of the members of the committee. I join with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] in saying that yesterday the opposition had their day in court. They are sorry they lost. I think they are simply sore losers in offering this amendment, and I urge the Members to vote against the amendment.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate today considerable emphasis was placed on the fact that New England is a high-cost power area and that the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project was the answer to this problem. It is true that power costs in New England are high but to suggest that the Dickey-Lincoln project, or a series of them, will provide the answer to that problem is absolutely ridiculous.

This project is nothing but a mid-sixties WPA that will provide expensive power. Of course, the Government will write off so much of the costs that the true economics of the plan are not even mentioned. However, it is quite clear that alternate sources of power, either with nuclear energy or fossil fuels, can provide more power for a fraction of the cost. It is here proposed to spend over $300 million to build a powerplant 400 miles from the load center when the Yankee atomic plant, built several years ago, can produce more power than Dickey-Lincoln and that project cost only $38 million.

Now, I know the Secretary of the Interior has urged the construction of this project but I do not consider him an expert in nuclear power matters. I do wish he had examined the advisability of atomic energy being provided to New England but his lack of study of such an alternative leaves me bewildered. On page 423 of the hearings he indicated that he had no knowledge of any proposed atomic plants for New England or even if we had any nuclear plants located there now. He should have known that we not only have several projects proposed now but in the Yankee plant at Rowe, Mass., we have, over a period of 5 years, produced more atomic power than any other atomic plant in the world.

I have served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for 6 years. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I was interested in serving on the Joint Committee because of the military applications of atomic energy. However, I was also prompted to serve on the committee because of the high power costs in New England and I hoped that my service on the committee might help hasten the day when our power costs, derived from either nuclear or fossil fuels, would be competitive with other sections of this country. That day has arrived and, in fact, the future is even more promising.

The Atomic Energy Commission has this week provided me with information that indicates, for a plant entering service in 1969, which is before the Dickey-Lincoln project would become a reality, that the cost of electricity by atomic power would be considerably less than that provided by the Dickey project. Starting with a plant about 200,000-kilowatt capacity and increasing in size to 1 million kilowatts, we would find that costs would vary between 6 mills and 3.75 mills, compared to at least 8 mills for Dickey-Lincoln for preference customers. The costs of these plants would be about $200 a kilowatt for a plant of about 200,000 kilowatts to about $100 a kilowatt for a plant of 800,000 kilowatts. In fact, I was advised that this data is over a year old and "if updated for today's market prices and conditions would be somewhat more favorable for nuclear power." A revolution is occurring in the civilian atomic energy field. As of January 1965, after 15 years of development work, there was only 1,000 megawatts of nuclear

capacity in operation, and about 2,500 megawatts on order. However, in the past few months orders were placed for over 3,000 megawatts of additional capacity. In other words, sales in the past few months have equaled the total for the last 15 years. It is interesting to note that New England is leading the entire country in this effort. Latest figures also indicate that coal and oil can also produce power cheaper than that which the proponents claim for Dickey-Lincoln.

I intend to support the amendment to have this project deleted from this bill because, first, it will obviously produce very expensive power; second, there are cheaper ways to produce power in New England; third, there is no market for this power which is 400 miles away from the load center; and fourth, excepting for its WPA nature will not inure to the benefit of New England. With the marked advances in power technology here and on the horizon, it would not be wise to proceed with this inflexible, high cost project which is expensive to the taxpayer and unresponsive to the need for lower power costs in New England.

As an indication of the serious questions in the minds of the people I represent, I am enclosing herewith some newspaper editorials on this subject:

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger, July 10, 1965]

POWER AND WATER

Does it make any sense for the Federal Government to put a huge, extravagant power project in the wilds of Maine?

Washington seems to think so, as it continues to come up with proposals for hydroelectric projects in northern Maine.

While President Johnson last week expressed concern over the urgent water problem in New England, the Government's desire for a hydroelectric plant completely overlooks the possibilities of a New England project that could provide power for the region and add to our water supplies by desalinization of sea water, both through nuclear energy.

The dreamed-of Passamaquoddy Bay tidal powerplant—under discussion for four decades—now has been laid to rest for the time being. Even Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall now concedes that the Quoddy plan he recommended in 1963 now is no longer economically feasible.

Instead, the Government now proposes a $227 million hydroelectric power project in northern Maine at the Lincoln School-Dickey site just above the confluence of the St. John and Allagash Rivers. Secretary Udall claims the plan would not flood the Allagash River, thus preserving one of the Nation's few remaining wild river areas, and would provide cheap power for all of New England.

This action is not unexpected. In fact, for some time now, New England utility interests have suspected that the Government was introducing the Quoddy project as a straw man, with the intention of introducing a smaller-scaled hydroelectric plan at the Dickey site once the critics had demolished the Quoddy proposals.

The latest recommendation is far less ambitious than the billion-dollar Quoddy plan. But it is still open to some of the objections raised against Quoddy.

In the nuclear age it seems incredible that the Government wants to put a hydroelectric plant so far from New England's population centers. This means, of course, that if New England is to benefit from power generated on the St. John River, transmission lines will have to be strung for hundreds of miles.

This seems obviously uneconomic when the costs of electricity produced by nuclear plants have been dropping steadily and are not far from being cheaper than conventionally produced power. And nuclear powerplants have proven to be safe enough for location near centers of population.

For example, Commonwealth Edison Co., in Chicago, is now building the Nation's largest atomic power station. The 700,000-kilowatt unit is estimated to cost $76 million. Compare that with the Government's St. John River proposal of a 794,000-kilowatt unit costing $227 million.

The new nuclear plant is expected to generate and deliver power to the Chicago area at a cost 5 to 10 percent lower than Commonwealth Edison's new conventional units under construction.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has predicted that large nuclear power plants (more than 500,000 kilowatts) probably will be able to produce electricity costing about 4 to 5 mills per kilowatt-hour and lower. Secretary Udall says power from the St. John River project could be delivered to preference customers in Maine for 7 to 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. What the cost would be in other New England customers, for instance in Boston, is unclear.

But at any rate, by the time the St. John River project could be completed it might be utterly obsolete because of advances in nuclear power technology.

Also to be considered is the possibility of a dual-purpose atomic plant, producing power and purifying sea water for consumption.

Dr. Seaborg, in a copyrighted interview in U.S. News & World Report, says: "We are particularly interested in the so-called dual-purpose reactors—that is, reactors that produce electricity and at the same time use the waste heat, which would otherwise be dissipated, to desalt water. By the 1980's we expect that there will be huge dual-purpose reactors. Reactors that would be developing a thousand megawatts—that is, a million kilowatts—of electricity, or more, and perhaps desalting water to the extent of 500 million gallons a day."

Such a plant would be ideal for New England of course, which is waking up to the fact that its water supplies are inadequate.

The Government's interest in a big, public hydroelectric project Down East seems to make less and less sense when viewed against the potentialities of nuclear power. While the Government has cited the benefits of low-cost power as a boon to New England industry and as a way of stimulating the economy of depressed northern Maine, unfortunately it has not shown the same solicitude for New England by continuing unreasonable quotas on imports of residual fuel oil which force power companies to pay more for this fuel used in generating electricity.

Instead of concentrating its studies on Maine rivers and bays, the Government should turn its attention to what nuclear power could do for the region.

[From the Haverhill Gazette, Aug. 26, 1965]

POWER VERSUS WATER

Representatives of New England's investor-owned power companies, fighting proposed legislation for creation of a Federal hydroelectric power station in northern Maine, are making some strong arguments in their opposition stand.

They have argued in congressional hearings that the existing companies, constantly improving their service and building more nuclear stations, are providing power now even more cheaply than the Government can produce it.

There are many who feel, of course, the Government has no business producing power in the first place, that this is another step toward socialism.

Others who oppose the project base their opposition on the advantages that might be lost to Maine if the power facility floods areas that are potentially of great recreational value.

New England already has plenty of electrical power, and the private firms are constantly expanding to keep up with the demand. It is the view of many persons who have looked into the situation that the Federal Government could put its $300 million into something New England lacks, instead of something it already has.

Take water resources, for instance. This area has a shortage during this drought because States and communities have not properly conserved their water supplies. Beyond that—and this is where it could affect Haverhill and the Merrimack Valley—our rivers are among the worst in the Nation where pollution is concerned.

If persons in Washington who want to spend money in New England would direct their efforts toward providing funds for pollution control, they would be doing us a far greater favor than they could ever do by building another power dam in northern Maine.

The advantages of cleaning rivers would be apparent in far shorter time than any powerplant in the forests of Maine. Since rivers like the Merrimack are interstate waterways, and since it is the Federal Government which is making the most noise about their conditions, it would seem Washington has the prime obligation to provide the funds for such projects.

It would be far better for the Federal Government to relieve taxpayers in Haverhill and other communities of the staggering bills for cleaning rivers than to intrude on the province of private enterprise by going into the electrical business.

We'll be glad to get that Federal money if Congress just can't resist spending it.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 25, 1965]

ST. JOHN GIFT HORSE

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, is furious with the New England Council for opposing the construction of a $227 million Federal power project at Dickey-Lincoln School on Maine's St. John River.

This is understandable, because the Senator has worked hard to steer the huge public works project through the Upper Chamber (as a rider to the rivers and harbors bill) and he does not want to lose it in the House, where it is now pending. A lot of jobs are involved, and the project could mean much to northern Maine's non-too-healthy economy.

Nevertheless, we are disposed to side with the council—at least until the facts are explored a little more.

For if Maine would gain something from the project, it and the whole New England region would lose something, too. The Dickey-Lincoln School project, while sparing the Allagash wilderness, would destroy a vast natural recreation area along the St. John. And in the long run these unique recreation areas may be more valuable to Maine than cheap hydroelectric power.

Testimony before the House committee this month raised a serious question whether power produced at the Dickey-Lincoln School site would be economically competitive with that now being produced by private utilities here, and this admittedly is not cheap.

Many people believe that within the next decade or so atomic power will provide the answer to all New England's electric problems, including its cost problems, in which case the St. John River project will certainly become obsolete. Does the region really

want to destroy another great natural asset on the off chance that this will not happen.

We think that the New England Council has a point and that Congress should take a long second look before approving this doubtful project.

[From the Salem (Mass.) Evening News, Aug. 20, 1965]

WHY GO BACKWARD?

Lower rates for electricity in the New England area are predicted through the gradual harnessing of atomic power. A rate drop of 30 percent within the next 15 years is expected, a Federal Power Commission study reveals. Use of nuclear energy is the modern trend, moving New England away from dependence upon high cost fuels. Combining the rapid technological progress in the atomic power field with the economies of new pumped storage installations is expected to cut electric rates almost one-third by 1980.

Now that atomic power looms as the means of liberating New England from the burden of expensive electric production it would seem that everyone should rejoice at the prospect of reduced electric rates. But not so. There rises on the congressional horizon the bogey of a Federal power project at Dickey-Lincoln School in Maine. The Government plans to sink $300 million of the taxpayers' money in a hydroelectric system that is rapidly becoming obsolescent before the rise of atomic fuel.

Is it progress to turn back to an old-fashioned method of electric production? Especially when the Federal project would be incapable of bringing power to the New England region at a production cost as low as that of systems using nuclear power plants and pumped storage stations.

The Federal project can only result in retarding development of the nuclear power industry on which New England relies as the only practical means of cutting electric rates. Seven atomic powerplants already are in operation or underway. The Yankee plant at Rowe in the past year produced more power from a $40 million private investment than the unnecessary Maine project would produce in 1971, when its completion is scheduled.

By 1980 at least 7,500,000 kilowatts of atomic power will be available in the area from atomic plants.

As for the power output of the Maine project, no marketing plan exists although 90 percent of the power would be used outside of Maine. The power would be too expensive for New England utilities to buy. And the whole project would return not a dollar in tax revenues. Then why build it?

The millions sought total about 10 percent of the huge public works omnibus bill already okayed by the Senate. A rush of protests from constituents to their Congressmen would help House Members decide that the issue deserves a lot more study.

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Evening Item, Aug. 21, 1965]

WHAT PRICE NORTHEAST POWER?

Congress should take a hard and hesitant look at a current bill which seeks a $220 million authorization for construction of a Federal power project at Dickey-Lincoln School in Maine. It is a measure that deserves defeat and we hope our New England congressional delegation will lead the way in rejecting it.

The stated goal of this project is to bring low-cost power to the New England region at an apparent expected cost of 7 to 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. Actually, some Northeast sources of power are now at less than 6 mills and by 1971, when the Maine project would be operative, public utilities would be producing power at about 4½ mills per kilowatt-hour through use of nuclear powerplants and pumped storage stations.

The Dickey-Lincoln scheme is basically a case of the Government spending more money to build a power producing plant than would be done by private companies for a plant of the same capacity. The resultant cost from the Government-owned operation would be greater than that from the privately-owned plant. And, finally, no taxes would be paid in local areas where the plant is located because the Maine project would not contribute a single tax dollar at local, State, or Federal levels. A privately owned plant would pay full taxes

It is all too reminiscent of another Passamaquoddy dream—and at a cost that would be approximately seven times greater than the projected tunnel between England and France There's no need in New England for a TVA-style Government venture when private interests can do it better—and at much less cost

---

[From the Gloucester Times, Aug. 27, 1965]

DICKEY-LINCOLN WON'T CUT OUR POWER COSTS

The proposed Federal hydroelectric plant on the St. John River near the Maine-Canadian border may seem remote from Massachusetts. It isn't. The so-called Dickey-Lincoln School electric project wants to sell its power as far south as the Boston area.

Maine legislators are jubilant at the prospect of the Federal Government spending $302 million (including $75 million for transmission lines). They feel the project will not only help unemployment for a few years during the construction period, it will open up and develop the vast Maine forests. Instead of a preserve for lumber companies and a few hardy sportsmen, the area will draw commerce and industry. (At present 16 corporations and 4 families own 75 percent of the sparsely populated woodland in the northern half of Maine.)

The New England Governors have endorsed the project. The basic reasoning seems to be—"Let's get this Federal money. If we don't, Texas or points south and west will."

After examining the pros and cons we cannot endorse the Dickey-Lincoln project. We can't see how it is going to lower power costs for New England. We think the best approach to lower power cost is through atomic electric plants.

The various classes of electricity users in New England pay between 9 and 40 percent above the national average. To turn the generators that make electricity, New England must import coal and oil. The coal and oil lobby in Washington has also been successful in curbing imports of low-cost residual oil into New England.

But let's get down to facts and figures. The Government promises it will deliver wholesale electricity to Boston for 7 to 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. But the New England Power Co. says its Salem, Mass., plant is producing wholesale electricity right now at 6 to 7 mills. The new plant at Brayton Point is producing electricity at 6 mills.

The Boston Edison Co. has a plant producing at about 6 mills. Admittedly these are the most efficient of the conventional plants.

The Federal planners didn't even bother to consult the private utilities about possible sales of power. The utilities say they are not interested at the 7- to 8-mill price. They are already doing better than that in their newest plants.

It seems to us the advocates of the Dickey-Lincoln project have overlooked the facts in the rapidly developing atomic field. Atomic produced electric power was pioneered at the Rowe, Mass., plant. Although this experimental plant produces electricity at 9 mills, the plant now under construction at Haddam, Conn., expects to turn out electricity at between 6 and 7 mills. This includes paying Federal, State, and local taxes.

According to a publication of the Federal Reserve Bank in Boston, the Jersey Central Power & Light Co., based on the builder's bid, expects to produce electricity from an atomic plant at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The Federal Reserve publication says most authorities now believe only atomic electric plants will be built in New England during the next 10 years. Even with a 150-percent increase in New England electric usage by 1980, atomic plants will supply all the base-load needs for the region. Boston Edison has four bids on an atomic plant under consideration. The trend is clear.

For the peak period (from dark to about 11 p.m.), the private utilities have worked out a system of pumped storage. After midnight when power use drops, the atomic plants will be kept going and the power sent to privately owned hydroelectric dams. The offpeak power will be used to pump water below the dam back into the reservoir. The next evening when the peak demand starts at 5 p.m., the water will be released and the power recovered at the time it is needed.

Here are some startling figures. The electric companies say that it would only cost them $71 million to produce 794,000 kilowatts of power if the atomic plant and pumped storage system were used. To get that amount of power and distribute it, the Federal Government proposes to spend $302 million for Dickey-Lincoln in Maine. The Federal project is tax free, but the utilities have figured in all their taxes and interest charges.

It seems clear, that if the Federal Government or anyone else wants to get into the New England power business it should build atomic plants.

The cities and towns of New England should remember how much property tax revenue they get from the private utilities. The New England Power Co. which supplies our area and others rank in the top 5 taxpayers in 219 municipalities. In 131 of those cities and towns it is the largest taxpayer. Our hard-pressed municipalities can't afford to lose that kind of tax revenue.

The Federal Government's famous TVA project in Tennessee can be justified because at the time it was built, the private power companies didn't have the money and weren't interested. New England utilities are pioneers in the use of atomic energy and have proven they are interested. Atomic energy will soon cut our power costs if we let the utilities do it. Dickey-Lincoln won't.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the well-known news analyst, Eric Sevareid, recently returned to Washington from important overseas assignments. Last Tuesday, in the Washington Evening Star, Mr. Sevareid had an interesting editorial column entitled "Time for a Pause To Reflect." In the column he said:

The American political capital is in dire need of the pause that reflects, even if it does not refresh. People are intellectually exhausted, but don't know it. They are not allowed to feel it, because events and the President won't let them.

Even God rested on the seventh day, and since it would be presumptuous to think that He got tired, one has to assume He paused to reflect on what He had done.

It is true this 89th Congress has already enacted an awesome list of far-reaching legislation. Only time will give a true picture of its wisdom and implication on the Nation and the people. The magnitude of this legislation has

even prompted our able young colleague from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the president of the organization of first-term Members from the other side of the aisle, to write a note to the President saying: "It is time to pause."

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today another major landmark in this stream of measures, the 1965 rivers and harbors and flood control bill. As stewards of our Nation's wealth and resources, we are again being called upon to decide what is in the best long-range interest of all our people.

We, the Congress, have been chosen by the votes of conscientious American citizens to represent them in accepting the tremendous responsibility of making the laws which affect them and their resources. Each succeeding bill sharpens the issue of whether we would be reducing or expanding or managing wisely the remaining balance of resources available to meet the Nation's needs in the years ahead. Consequently, the importance of sound decisions—and the inherent danger of shortcuts—increases geometrically with the effect these decisions have on the remaining balance of resources. I hope and pray that history will not find America wanting because of unwise actions we might take.

Mr. Chairman, great publicity has been given by the executive branch over the past year to its efforts to eliminate waste in Government. God knows how badly that is needed. But, the real issue with which the Congress of the United States should be wrestling is whether we are achieving the most efficient allocation of our resources, material and human. This involves, first, a clear cataloging of available resources, present and future, and second, a determination, on a priority basis, of our greatest needs as a people. It involves formulation of creative and imaginative plans for meeting such needs and the ascertainment and evaluation of the resulting consequences of each possible alternative. Achieving the most efficient allocation of our resources also involves analysis and choice between existing programs and new proposals, between investment and current expense, between accomplishment by Government and by private enterprise. Such program evaluations are fundamental to attainment of wise and meaningful conclusions. The manner and degree of the use of the Nation's resources will determine whether we are to become a "have" or a "have not" nation.

Mr. Chairman, the 1965 rivers and harbors and flood control bill, as reported by the Committee on Public Works, includes a number of proposals which have not been tested adequately against the principles of sound stewardship I have just mentioned. I question whether it is in the best interest of ourselves, the Nation, and future generations to take the gamble these projects involve. There are three points in particular I wish to discuss.

First. Title I provides for the planning of a vast new complex of water storage, conveyance, and purification works to be accomplished solely by the Federal Government through the Corps of Engineers. This extensive new scheme comes almost immediately on the heels of the Water Resources Planning Act—Public Law 89–80—approved July 22, 1965. The principles embodied in the Water Resources Planning Act have been studied for decades and the concept of that law has had the support of at least the last four administrations. That act clearly declares it to be "the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprise with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprises, and others concerned," rather than having comprehensive water resources planned unilaterally by one agency. The Water Resources Planning Act provides for establishment of river basin commissions to prepare and coordinate these comprehensive plans.

The need for studies of long-range water requirements of the Northeastern United States is unquestioned. But, the proposed authorization for a unilateral Federal study by the Corps of Engineers represents a complete reversal of the policy of comprehensive and coordinated planning, expressed in a law hardly 2 months old. I think it is unprecedented and the height of frivolity to assign full responsibility to one Federal agency for providing all facilities, including a new function never before considered a Federal activity—purification and treatment works—with the attendant abdication by all other Federal agencies as well as States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprises, and others as described in Public Law 89–80, without detailed analysis, evaluation, and hearing. Such a sudden major reversal of the studies and travail which resulted in the enactment of Public Law 89–80 would be shocking. Certainly the conception in that law should be given a fair opportunity to prove itself, or should be, at least, assaulted directly, not covertly, so that all can understand what is at stake.

Second. Section 201(a) of title II of the bill would give blanket authority to the Corps of Engineers to construct any water resource development project if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10 million. Appropriations for prosecution of the work could not be made unless approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively.

For 145 years the Congress has insisted on specific authorization of major works of the Corps of Engineers. Without careful examination of the need and justification for such a substantial departure from historic procedure, a new practice is to be initiated. I know my colleagues on the Public Works Committee possess great knowledge in this field, but I seriously question whether undertakings of this character and magnitude should be prosecuted without the regular procedure of hearing, review, evaluation, consideration, and approval of the entire Congress. The need for such urgency has not been established. Now that the Public Works Committee seems to have adopted a policy of introducing a river and harbor and flood control bill each year, there is no need for short-circuiting the established legislative process.

The language of this provision is also so broad as to encompass a scope of development far beyond anything heretofore considered to be within the purview of the Federal responsibility. "Any" water resource project would be eligible and its total cost could be unlimited. Only the "estimate" of its "Federal" first cost could not exceed $10 million.

Third. Section 204 of title II would authorize the Dickey-Lincoln School project, St. John River in Maine. I emphasized earlier the importance to ourselves and future generations that our limited resources are used most efficiently and have suggested the steps required to be taken to guarantee that they are. I find repeated support for this approach in statements of executive branch officials. For example, Budget Director Charles L. Schultze said in an article in the Tax Foundation's Tax Review, dated August 1965:

> The efficient allocation of resources in the Federal sector of the economy requires * * * a choice of the least-cost method of carrying on a given program—in other words, cost reduction.
>
> Our major need is a much wider application of improved methods, techniques, and systems analysis to the definition of program objectives, the measurement of performance and the weighing of alternatives as the basis for decisions.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, which will cost some $300 million or more when basic electric transmission lines are included is, for all intents and purposes, totally a Federal power project. Ninety-eight percent of the alleged benefits are from electric power. Nine-tenths of the remaining 2 percent of benefits are for area redevelopment, leaving only two-tenths of 1 percent, or $40,000 for flood control, a traditional Corps of Engineer function. The project must be evaluated, therefore, almost solely on its power efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that our hardworking and conscientious colleagues on the Public Works Committee barely approved this project by a vote of 18 to 15. I am not a member of that distinguished committee but, having served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for some 16 years, I think my credentials are in order to speak with some knowledge on water resource development and hydroelectric dams. This St. John—Dickey-Lincoln School—project, which has always been considered in connection with the discredited Passamaquoddy project, has been ramrodded this far through Congress by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. Because of their experience, the members of the Public Works Committee may be pretty familiar with the Corps of Engineers, its activities, and its programs. But, because of my experience, I may know a little bit more about the Department of the Interior, its activities, and its programs, and let me assure each and

every one of the Members here today that some of the proposals and activities of the Department of the Interior, as they relate to the development of Federal electric power, leave much to be desired.

Time and time again I have stood in the well of this House to tell my colleagues about the almost unbelievable attempts of the Department of the Interior to further the cause of public power. I have discussed the millions of dollars that are being lost annually by the power marketing agencies of the department. Despite this tremendous annual loss in every single one of its marketing agencies, Secretary Udall glibly tells the Public Works Committee—according to the transcript of the hearings before that group—that, of course, a new power administration would have to be created in New England to market the power from the Dickey-Lincoln School project. The Secretary also admitted under careful cross-examination that no attempt has yet been made by any official of his Department to discuss with potential customers in New England the possibilities of marketing this block of power. This should be a startling revelation about the slipshod way this project has been conceived, nurtured, and foisted on the Congress and the unsuspecting American public. It is not startling to me, however, because I have dealt with that agency too closely too long.

Mr. Chairman, even in the report of other Government agencies to the Secretary of the Interior on the combined St. John-Passamaquoddy project, some of them admitted that alternative methods of generation could and would produce electric power more cheaply in New England. In addition to the many admonitions and expressions of Government officials emphasizing how essential it is to select the best way of doing things, the need for comparing alternatives to show the relative economic efficiency of a project and available alternatives is set forth in the administration's statement of "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources"—Senate Document No. 97. Chapter V, paragraph C2, of that document states that comprehensive plans shall be formulated to include units and purposes which, among other things, satisfy the following criteria:

> There is no more economical means, evaluated on a comparable basis, of accomplishing the same purpose or purposes which could be precluded from development if the plan were undertaken. This limitation refers only to those alternative possibilities that would be physically displaced or economically precluded from development if the project is undertaken.

The hearing record before the Public Works Committee clearly establishes that there are more economic alternatives. The Department of the Interior reports on the project succinctly point out that there are more economical means than Dickey of producing power in the New England area. Such other means, however, are rejected because there is no Federal authority to undertake them. In other words, if the Federal Government cannot do it, it is not an acceptable alternative. Such specious reasoning not only makes a mockery of the comparability test, but also exposes the real objectives of the Interior Department—Federal power regardless of cost or economics.

Non-Federal interests have confirmed the findings of Interior that power can be produced more economically by nuclear energy and pumped storage, yet the pressures to authorize this uneconomic and inefficient proposed Federal development persist. It has not even been studied from the standpoint of securing the best development of the resources of the area.

This country cannot afford the luxury of building the Dickey-Lincoln School project, at least as presently conceived, merely to advance a philosophical and ideological ambition.

Mr. Chairman, I have briefly discussed three major provisions of S. 2300, as reported to the House of Representatives, which involve fundamental policies of Government as well as enormous expenditures. There are other provisions in the bill of similar import. This body, if it is to act responsibly, must insist on a much more careful review of their implications and potentials before giving them its approval. It is pitiful that we are about to embark on some of these significant new ventures in such a casual way. The time for demonstration of interest, concern, and integrity is here. I hope we will capitalize on this opportunity to make sound decisions and to give statesmanlike direction to these matters because if we fail to do so—

> The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
> Moves on: nor all our piety nor wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
> Nor all our tears wash out a word of it.

Mr. Chairman, the St. John project can and must be stricken from this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that in his opinion the "noes" had it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CLARK and Mr. BLATNIK.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 132, noes 130.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct an inquiry to the committee, perhaps the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

I am concerned over the language which appears at page 46, line 24 of the bill, wherein it is stated in subparagraph (3) that "the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife."

The House report accompanying the 1966 public works appropriation bill would prohibit certain purchases of land.

I quote from that report:

> The committee has not approved the use of any funds for the purchase of land in fee for a sump area or a wildlife refuge on the Yazoo Backwater project in Issaquena and Warren Counties.

I may say that the report accompanying the bill S. 2300 states that the Bureau of the Budget recommends the acquisition of land for fish and wildlife purposes in the Hillside floodway.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama this question. Is it intended that the language in the Senate bill, S. 2300, which I quoted a moment ago overrides or vitiates or nullifies or repeals the prohibition contained in the report of the Committee on Appropriations from which I quoted a moment ago?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No; this provision is not intended to override the prohibition the gentleman refers to. It has to do, instead, with the matter of cost sharing between Federal and non-Federal interests in land they would be authorized to purchase.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very grateful to the gentleman for clarifying that for me. I have one further question to ask the gentleman. Do I understand that future appropriations will have to be made before they could purchase land as purchased by this bill; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It certainly would require an appropriation in order to purchase this land.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUNKEL

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KUNKEL: Page 44, after line 21, insert the following: "The projects for Lazer Creek Reservoir, Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, and the project for Spewrell Bluff Reservoir authorized by the Act of December 30, 1963 (Public Law 88–253), are each modified to provide that a private power company may construct, own, operate, and maintain the hydroelectric power facilities at such reservoir if, within 2 years of the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Power Commission (1) licenses such company to do so in accordance with the Federal Power Act, and other applicable provisions of law, and (2) fixes, in accordance with section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act, the charges to be paid by the licensee for use of the dam so as to reimburse the Federal Government for project costs allocated to power during the period of the license. The operation and maintenance of such hydroelectric power facilities by a private power company shall be in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army."

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered would provide for a joint Federal-private development of the Flint River Basin, Georgia, by the Federal Government and a private power company. The joint development of the Flint River Basin will promote a closer partnership between government and private enterprise and will result in a reduction in Federal expenditures for the development of that river.

In 1962, the Chief of Engineers recommended a comprehensive plan for de-

velopment of the Flint River. This plan included construction of the Spewrell Bluff, Lazer Creek, and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Dams and Reservoirs in the headwaters for flood control, hydroelectric power generation, general reaction and fishing recreation, and two other projects, primarily for navigation, below Albany, Ga. The general plan was approved by Congress in 1963, but only the construction of the Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir was authorized at that time.

The bill now being considered would authorize the other two headwater projects at Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee Creek at an estimated Federal cost of $88,653,000. The total estimated cost of these two projects and Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir is $156,455,000, of which $52 million, or one-third of the entire cost, is for construction of the hydroelectric power features.

The amendment which I have offered would provide that a private power company may construct, own, operate, and maintain the hydroelectric power facilities at each of these three reservoirs if, within 2 years after the date of enactment of this legislation, the Federal Power Commisssion licenses such company to do so in accordance with the Federal Power Act and other applicable provisions of law, and fixes, in accordance with section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act, the charges to be paid by the licensee for use of the dam so as to reimburse the Federal Government for project costs allocated to power during the period of the time of the license. The operation and maintenance of such hydroelectric power facilities by a private power company would be in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Chairman, the Georgia Power Co. has made a firm offer in hearings before the committee to build, maintain, and operate powerhouses, and incidental facilities at the three dams under FPC license and in a manner satisfactory to the Corps of Engineers. The company would make annual payments which would fully repay the Federal Government for the project costs allocated to power.

Mr. Chairman, the present and immediately past Governors of Georgia have gone on record as favoring a joint project. The U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins, has recommended a joint venture. Local interests have given overwhelming support for joint development.

Joint construction of these three projects would result in a reduction in the Federal investment of $52 million. Furthermore, independent auditors have estimated that joint projects at these three sites would generate over the 50-year period of the projects approximately $41 million in additional Federal income taxes. In addition, the company would pay the Government an estimated $2.3 million annually for use of the dams.

The State, counties, and school districts would also substantially benefit. State income taxes attributable to the private portion of the projects over the 50-year period are estimated to be $4.5 million. State and county ad valorem taxes are estimated at $20.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, Federal construction of power generating facilities at the Spewrell Bluff, Lazer Creek, and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Dams and Reservoirs is not warranted. Private investment, in cooperation with the Federal Government, can accomplish the purposes with many additional public advantages.

Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere hope that this amendment will be adopted.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KUNKEL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania would, of course, permit the private power development at these particular dam sites, would it not? I speak of the three dam sites in the authorization. Would not that action be consistent with the recommendation of the Resource Advisory Board of the Southeast River Basin of which Georgia is a participant? They have recommended that that be done on a partnership basis with private power companies putting in the facilities needed for power development and the Federal Government putting in the facilities needed for the necessary rivers, harbors, and flood control development. Is that not correct?

Mr. KUNKEL. That is correct.

Most importantly, it would enable the river development to go right along as planned.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL]. I oppose the amendment for a variety of reasons, foremost among which is that if there is any sphere of activity in this Nation where the Federal Government has an undisputed right to participate in a full development, if it so desires, it is in the development, construction, and operation of multiple-purpose river development projects. This is exactly the type of project involved here, in a three-dam complex, each of which is a multiple-purpose dam of which hydroelectric power generation is one phase, navigation is another phase, flood control is another, and recreation is an additional phase.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the distinguished gentleman. It seems to me it would be a tragedy in the development of these resources if we only partially developed them. If power, flood control, and recreation are all justified, why not develop them so that their full potential can be realized?

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comments and for his contribution.

This project is one which is an investment in the future. It is an investment in the future development of this particular area just as it is an investment in the development of the United States of America.

This is a full payout project. The benefit-to-cost ratio exceeds unity. The benefit-to-cost ratio on the 3-dam complex stands at better than 1.3 to 1, which means for every dollar invested $1.30 will be paid back in benefits.

We feel that this is a measure which has long been pending in the Congress of the United States, one to which the House Committee on Public Works and the Senate Committee on Public Works have given serious study over the years.

I heartily subscribe to this development, and I endorse the language of the committee bill, which provides for full Federal development of the Flint River.

The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would do more than affect the projects which are contained in this bill. It would have the effect of deauthorizing a project which was authorized in December of 1963.

I urge the rejection of the amendment and the passage of S. 2300 including the language of the Committee on Public Works, which provides for full Federal development on this project is very important to our State and our Nation.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. CALLAWAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have previously testified before the Committee on Public Works and spoken in general debate on this bill, and I am wholeheartedly in favor of the full development of the Flint River.

The question raised by this amendment, however, is not whether the Flint River shall be developed, but how it can best be developed.

Under this amendment, private power would be given permission to participate in the development of the great Flint River.

Although I enthusiastically support this amendment, I have hesitated to speak in its behalf, because I have wanted to assure myself that I am representing all of my constituents and not just representing one particular company. I say this because for the last few years, and up until the time I was elected to this Congress, I served as a Member of the Board of Directors of the Georgia Power Co., and this is the private power company which serves this area, the company that could be affected by this amendment.

On further reflection, however, I have felt that I should speak on this amendment for a number of reasons. First, although my service on the power company board might tend to influence my

judgment, this same service has certainly given me firsthand knowledge of the facts in this case.

Second and more important to me, millions of dollars of tax money for my constituents and yours will go into this project. Thus I feel that I have an obligation to them and to all of the citizens of this country to try to save that tax money.

The Georgia Power Co. has had a long-standing interest in all Georgia rivers and specifically in the Flint River. As early as 1909 the company began to purchase land and flood rights at the sites of the very dams mentioned in this amendment. Throughout the years the Georgia Power Co. has built 17 separate dams to complement its steam generation plants with hydroelectric peaking capacity. The company has always been ready to build additional dams as this peaking power capacity was needed. In 1961 the company requested a preliminary permit from the Federal Power Commission to survey the Flint River in the hope of being granted permission for a private development of the river at no expense to the taxpayer. Unfortunately, this request was turned down by the Commission because the Corps of Engineers was studying the project. Now the Georgia Power Co. has made a firm offer to build, maintain, and operate the powerhouses on the Flint River. It is estimated that this will save the taxpayers a minimum of $52 million. It was pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that additional payments in addition to that will save another $181 million over a 150-year period.

I agree with the majority leader that it would be a tragedy if this river were not fully developed, but it can be by the power company and the Government in partnership.

The Governor of Georgia, Mr. Sanders, favors the joint participation by private power in this development. The immediate past governor of Georgia, Mr. Vandiver, favored this development. The Georgia Waterways Commission, which is the official agency of the State of Georgia charged with the development of its rivers, favors it. The U.S. Study Commission, on the southeast river basins, rendered a comprehensive report in favor of joint development. Many mayors, councils, county commissions, and groups in the Flint River area have gone on record in favor of joint development. They are particularly interested in the local ad valorem taxes that would be developed by private power development and ownership of these projects.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not require a single thing. It just gives the private power company the chance to bid and prove its case. If they can prove their case to the Federal Power Commission, then they have an opportunity to participate.

Mr. Vinson, when he offered a similar proposal in the House, had language that would make private development mandatory. This is merely permissive for private power to participate.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for all of us who are for saving the taxpayers' money and for free enterprise to stand up. The time is now, and I wholeheartedly support this amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The amount of Federal taxpayer money involved in this amendment is $52 million. Is that correct?

Mr. CALLAWAY. That is the estimate. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. This is the opportunity for those who are worried about the cost of this Government, which is going up constantly, particularly with the defense effort needed now, to save $52 million with this one amendment and let private enterprise do what they can admittedly do and what the people in Georgia say should be done on this project. This is the time for them to act.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That is correct. This will save $52 million at this time and throughout all the years of taxpaying will save much more. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman has made an outstanding contribution to this debate and I congratulate him.

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee went into a detailed study of the Flint River project. We were thoroughly convinced in the Committee on Public Works that it would be in the best interests of all concerned to develop this river as a Federal project. In this particular area of Georgia the rivers run red with the soils of the surrounding hillsides. We expect to take this development further down the river in years to come and do not want to be involved in any long-term agreements with private power companies which might in some way hamper future development.

I urge that we support the committee and defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" had it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KUNKEL and Mr. BLATNIK.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 87, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The CLERK. Page 78, line 1:

TITLE III—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 301. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

Navigation

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

Rondout Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 274, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,090,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers—Removal of Drift in the Washington Metropolitan Area: House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,310,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Documents Numbered 226 and 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,569,000. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, shall include facilities to mitigate damages to presently improved areas southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of $40,000. The Chief of Engineers may include additional faciliteis to mitigate damages to additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge if he determines them to be necessary and justified, at an estimated additional cost of $60,000. All such facilities to mitigate damages shall be maintained by local interests.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000. In order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $570,000, except that the modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, contained in letter of April 5, 1965, from the Department of the Army to the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, shall apply with respect to recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 269, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,840,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000.

The project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645; 74 Stat. 480) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct a steel bulkhead at cut numbered 1. Local interests shall contribute to the cost of the project an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of this project that would have been required for cut numbered 1, but for this modification.

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. In view of the willingness of the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a deep-draft public harbor in that vicinity, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such a harbor according to a design agreed upon by the Secretary of the Army and the State of Indiana, subject to the following conditions: (1) The amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with the State of Indiana, and approved by the President; (2) such amount shall not exceed the cost to the United States of constructing an equivalent Federal harbor at the same site; (3) prior to the time that the monetary contribution, or any part thereof, is made available to the State of Indiana the Secretary of the Army and the State of Indiana shall have entered into an agreement providing for the operation of the harbor essentially as it would be operated by the Secretary of the Army had it been constructed as a Federal harbor; (4) no fees or tolls shall be charged for entrance to the outer harbor; (5) any other fees or charges collected by the State of Indiana shall not be used to cover any part of the contribution made by the Federal Government under this Act; (6) any funds appropriated under this authorization shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army and made available to the State of Indiana over the period of construction in proportion to the proposed annual expenditures of the State for construction of the outer harbor; and (7) at least sixty days prior to the date on which the Secretary of the Army makes available to the State of Indiana the initial installment of the monetary contribution authorized by this Act, he shall submit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives a letter report setting forth the basis for his determination under clause (1) above. Unless construction of the harbor is initiated within five years from the date of the enactment of this Act, the authority for the monetary contribution contained in this paragraph shall expire. Neither this paragraph nor the construction authorized by this paragraph shall adversely affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana dunes as a national lakeshore.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas: House Document Numbered 257, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $470,000;

Trinity River and tributaries, Texas: House Document Numbered 276, Eighty-ninth Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and there is hereby authorized $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000. The works for wavewash protection within the limits of the modified San Joaquin River navigation project shall be repaired or restored by the United States as determined to be necessary by the Secretary of the Army over the life of the project.

Crescent City Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 264, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,980,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests on such project after August 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

Beach erosion

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Duval County, Florida: House Document Numbered 273, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,266,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Haleiva Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,000;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

SEC. 302. Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of waterhyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasion watermilfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

SEC. 303. The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 304. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

Lake Dauterive and Chareton Floodgate, Louisiana.

Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

Manchester Harbor, Washington.

Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.

Calumet River, Illinois.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, from about mile 29 West of Harvey Lock to U.S. Highway No. 90 in vicinity of Boutte, Louisiana.

Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Withlacoochee River, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the project, with particular reference to provision for a side channel or connecting channel improvement through Cross Bayou to Old Tampa Bay, in the vicinity of Howard Frankland Bridge, for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

San Francisco County, California (beach erosion).

Lake Michigan Shoreline, Milwaukee County, Michigan (beach erosion).

Indian River County, Florida (beach erosion).

SEC. 305. The first proviso in the paragraph which begins "James River, Virginia:" in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874) is amended by striking out "after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date".

SEC. 306. Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1174) is amended by striking out "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$22,000".

SEC. 307. That portion of the East River, in New York County, State of New York, lying between the south line of East Seventeenth Street, extended eastwardly, the United States pierhead line as it existed on July 1, 1965, and the south line of East Thirtieth Street, extended eastwardly, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

SEC. 308. The old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Michigan, lying between the Monroe Harbor range front light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, is declared to be not a navigable stream of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given for the filling in of the old channel by the riparian owners on such channel.

SEC. 309. Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 303) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatend by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (1) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project of the reasonable cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of July 3, 1958, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States."

SEC. 310. (a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended by striking out "$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

(2) Subsection (b) of such section 107 is amended by striking out "$200,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(b) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended (1) by striking out "$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000", and (2) by striking out "$400,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any project under contract for construction on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 311. The project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is modified in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost (1) such protection for the Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway bridge over the Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet, (2) such temporary protection for the center pier and the south abutment of the New York, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad bridge (Nickel Plate) as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south bridge draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet prior to its replacement, and (3) such modification of the chanel limits as is necessary to insure full use of each such draw.

SEC. 312. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including, but not limited to, the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. Such model and center may be utilized, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. The study authorized by this section shall be given priority.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $8,500,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 313. (a) The Act approved December 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 846), authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges, including approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Illinois, is hereby revived and reenacted. This section (including the amendments made by this section) shall be null and void insofar as it authorizes the construction of a bridge or bridges unless actual construction thereof be commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of the enactment of this section.

(b) Section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge, or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connections with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 per centum per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this Act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed twenty-five years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount thereof shall be co calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges, acquired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for the use of said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not exceeding 105 and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. Subject to the provisions of any prior contracts or

obligations the commission may disburse any available bridge revenues or other funds or borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges under this Act and acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, provided that all notes evidencing the funds so borrowed, if not previously paid from such bridge revenues, shall be repaid from the proceeds of the bonds of the commission when issued for account of such new bridge or bridges. In the event the commission issues notes as hereinbefore in this section provided and said notes have not been otherwise paid and a new bridge or bridges are not built, said notes shall be paid from revenues derived from the operation of any other bridge or bridges owned by the commission, subject to the obligation of payment of all outstanding indebtedness for which said revenues have been therefore pledged. The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds, and to pay any other indebtedness of the commission, at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption, and may include, as a part of an issue of bonds to provide for the cost of a bridge to be constructed under this Act, sufficient additional bonds bearing interest at a rate or rates not exceeding 6 per centum per annum to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

"(b) Such bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for at least two consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for twelve months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises and riparian rights relating to the bridge, as well as the cost of abandonment or dismantlement of any existing bridge to be replaced thereby. If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter provided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denominations whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery."

(c) Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act of December 21, 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "the bonds and interest," and inserting in lieu thereof: "the bonds, the notes issued under section 5 of this Act, and the interest,".

(d) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved.

SEC. 314. The Act entitled "An Act creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois", approved July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669), as amended by the Act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59), is amended by inserting immediately after section 14 the following new section:

"SEC. 15. The Commission and its successors and assigns are authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois, subject to the provisions of this Act; except that the authority granted by this section shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of such bridge is commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of enactment of this section."

SEC. 315. The Secretary of the Army shall transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and related water resources development. The Secretary shall also submit a report explaining the proposed legislation, and making specific reference to each change in or omission of any provision of existing law.

SEC. 316. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall make a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, the Federal Government reimbursing States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public entities, for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and other water resources development purposes, to the extent that such expenditures are incurred after the initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for such authorized projects. The Secretary shall report to Congress, not later than January 31, 1967, the results of such study together with his recommendations in connection therewith.

SEC. 317. Title III of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

Mr. CRAMER (interrupting reading of title). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the minority, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. I have two survey resolutions which were inadvertently left out of the bill and I would like to have them read and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the gentleman has cleared these two amendments with this side, No. 1; and, second, the gentleman has stated his reason for offering them at this time is because they were inadvertently omitted when survey resolutions were considered in the committee and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, on what page does title 3 start?

The CHAIRMAN. Page 78 and goes to the end of the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, an amendment to page 61 is now not in order through unanimous consent; is that right?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLATNIK

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: Page 90, after line 6, insert the following: "Popponesset Bay, Massachusetts."

Page 91, after line 22, insert the following: "Marquette County, Michigan."

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: Page 90, strike out line 10 and all that follows down through and including line 3 on page 91.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to strike out on page 90 of the printed bill a section that sets up a study for de-icing the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, this study costs but a mere $75,000, and I feel a little bit hesitant to stand before you and plead economy, but only to save $75,000.

Let me tell you something about this amendment of mine, and this particular project of somebody's.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman he does not have to apologize as far as this gentleman is concerned for standing in the well and offering this proposal for the simple reason we had it up in the rivers and harbors omnibus bill 3 years ago, and in a separate bill. It was never acted on. The project is so asinine in itself that a study is not justified even if it cost only $5,000. It makes

this House ridiculous to consider such a project.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The gentleman is correct. Two years ago this study passed the Senate and the Public Works Committee, but it never got any further. Two years ago they thought they could make this study for $50,000. Now they have come back with it, and it has gone to $75,000. Perhaps I should not try to kill it, because if it comes back 2 years from now it may be up to $100,000. There was little or no evidence in favor of it. The Bureau of the Budget concurs with me. There is no evidence that there was any practical way of de-icing the Great Lakes. Here you are taking $75,000 of the taxpayers' money to study nothing. They have what they call a system of bubbling by putting bubbles into water and they can keep small areas of water free of ice, areas around a dredge, for instance, but can anybody in their right mind conceive of a situation where we are going to have the Great Lakes turned into one gigantic bubble bath?

This just makes no sense at all.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. I can conceive what the gentleman speaks of, not as a foolish gesture, but as a reality. I can envision water being kept in an uniced state.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yielded for a question. The gentleman should get his own time.

Mr. RONCALIO. The gentleman asked a question, and I answered it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield no further.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. The gentleman asked me a moment ago on what page this occurred. It is page 214, and if the gentleman would like to have this section I will give it to him.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Would the gentleman agree to put his amendment on ice for the time being?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I think that is where my amendment will go, but I want to be sure that the RECORD shows a description of the project and how at least I feel about it. It appears on page 236 of the majority report, but it is not described, it is not even referred to. You have to read the bill find it. On page 215 of the printed record, part 1, and I inserted in that part of the record of our hearings the minority views in which I expressed my views 2 years ago. Other than that the hearings have been quiet on this subject. I also inserted my views on this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 31, 1965—page 21594—it is not necessary to discuss them again in detail here. As I say, this is a small matter, but I hope that the chairman of the committee will agree to this amendment.

I urge the House to adopt my amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the only statement which had any semblance of reality, logic or commonsense that the gentleman made was the fact that $75,000 in a $2 billion public works authorization is not very much money. From then on he had just sheer fantasy.

In this bill we have over $5 million for an authorization for weed control. Here is the largest body of fresh water on this planet through which runs the longest inland waterway on this planet. We ask for an amount of money, $75,000, merely to review scientific information, processes and procedures that already exist and to select which one of them shows some promise of protecting ports from ice, which may extend the navigation season for whatever amount of time it may be extendable. We already have this enormous investment on the part of the Government in the channels and harbors. The States and municipalities have investment in terminal and harbor facilities and private industry has their investment in boats and shipping equipment and loading and unloading facilities and so forth and so on. A lake can be 95 percent open but if ice jams the Sault Saint Marie Locks or if it jams up the Welland Canal, then all intercontinental transoceanic traffic is stopped.

So I will read very quickly here the problem of icing conditions in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway have remained in the status quo for so long and only limited information of a scientific nature is available on specific ice formation and deicing problems. Extending the navigation season can best be accomplished by concentrating these investigations under proper conditions in order to improve the accuracy of the forecast as well as evaluate ice control methods which can be used to aid in the opening of navigation.

This approach offers the best chance of success and can provide major economic benefits. Any means of improving the accuracy of the forecast for the opening of navigation on various routes can save U.S. shippers significant sums of money which are now lost because fully crewed ships have to wait out the actual opening and the Corps of Engineers recognizes the feasibility of the study, the objectives of which are to investigate the practicability and means and economic justification for extending the shipping season.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment and the retention of this most modest amount of money for this purpose.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire about a project in this bill in the State of Iowa which is to be found, I think, on page 61 of the bill. I wonder if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] can tell us something about that. I would like to vote intelligently on this bill. I know he normally opposes all of these so-called pork-barrel projects and I wonder if the gentleman can conscientiously vote for this bill with this project in it?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether the gentleman from Iowa can enlighten the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Do not say that it is not easy because that is not like the gentleman. But go ahead.

Mr. GROSS. I would not say it is easy to enlighten the gentleman from Ohio. What does the gentleman want to know?

Mr. HAYS. Well there is $14 million here and the gentleman is a great watchdog of the Treasury, and I just wonder if the taxpayers can afford to spend $14 million out there which I understand $3 million of which is for urban renewal which the gentleman has not been known to favor heretofore.

I hope I have not rendered the gentleman speechless.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio is not now expressing concern about $14 million, is he—with his record of spending in the Congress?

Mr. HAYS. I am a big spender, but then you know I want to be consistent. I suppose I ought to be for this but the gentleman from Iowa is always against spending, especially for urban renewal, and I just wonder if it makes any difference if the urban renewal is in Ohio or in Iowa—or in my district or in his district?

Mr. GROSS. I was not aware that the gentleman from Iowa was against all spending. There is in the bill a project for a district adjoining the Third District of Iowa and which is a part of the $14 million. The gentleman might have brought the Democrat Member from Iowa into this discussion, and asked him to help to justify the project.

Mr. HAYS. I never thought the day would come when a question about money would render the gentleman from Iowa speechless or near speechless. Speak up if you can, my time is running out.

Mr. GROSS. I am perfectly able to talk. The gentleman from Ohio could make quite a downpayment on the $14 million if he would forgo a few of the junkets around the world that he takes.

Mr. HAYS. Though I told the gentleman from Iowa the story once before, since there are many new Members here, I shall tell the story again.

There were two Quakers who many years ago lived in the little town I came from. One of them liked to travel; the other did not.

One time the one friend who liked to travel came back from an around-the-world trip, and his fellow churchman met him in the town square and said, "Friend John, does not thee know that a rolling stone gathers no moss?"

The other replied, "Thee may be right, friend Asa; but it gets a lot of polish."

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on State Department personnel and foreign operations I need all the knowledge I can get. I recommend some foreign travel for the gentleman from Iowa. It not only gives polish; it helps cure parochialism.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am concerned with a project that appears on page 83 of the bill, the so-called Burns Waterway harbor project.

I am concerned that this project should not represent the latest triumph of the bulldozer in eliminating a great naturally beautiful area of our country. I am concerned that approval of this project should not mean the death of the proposal to make the sand dunes of Indiana a beautiful national park.

The Burns Harbor development has been the center of a controversy for years between those who favor conservation and those who want industrial development of the area. Those of us who favor conservation do not oppose industrial development; in fact, we are not opposed to the project as such. But what we are fearful of is that approval of this project may result in killing the establishment of the dunes as a national park.

This was certainly not the intent of the compromise that resulted from a White House study of the area in 1963. President Kennedy personaly took an interest in the area and instructed the Bureau of the Budget to look into the possibilities for both the industrial and recreational developments. The resulting compromise was confirmed in a letter dated 2 years ago this week, September 24, 1963, from the Bureau of the Budget to the Secretary of the Army. The letter stated:

> It is the President's wish to see a deep-draft harbor for Indiana made a reality, while at the same time preserving as much as possible of the priceless heritage of the Indiana Dunes for future generations.

The key words are "at the same time." This position has been affirmed and amplified on numerous occasions. Mr. Philip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference for the Bureau of the Budget, wrote in a letter to Senator HENRY JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on February 8 of this year:

> The Bureau of the Budget regards both the Burns Harbor and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore proposals as integral elements for a balanced development of the area.

On the same day, President Johnson stated his firm support for the national lakeshore in his message on natural beauty.

Up to the present time both proposals have gone forward concurrently. In fact, the bill that was passed by the Senate provided that no funds should be expended for the development of this harbor unless there should have been established a national park for the sand dunes of Indiana.

Now, apparently that is no longer the case.

Some say it may come with ill grace for a Member of Congress from the State of Illinois to take the floor to comment upon an area in Indiana. But, Mr. Chairman, many of my people in the city of Chicago use the Indiana sand dunes. It is one of the great remaining natural facilities in the entire country. The people of the entire Midwest are aware of this. They relish its beauty. It is a unique place and should be given appropriate recognition to preserve its beauties. It ranks in principle with Yellowstone, Glacier, and other national parks as natural retreats or sanctuaries, serving as centers of attraction for the people not only of Indiana but of the entire country. The sand dunes of Indiana deserve such recognition so that they belong to all the people of our country.

The lakeshore proposal accomplishes that which is truly a rarity in the United States today. It puts a park where people are. There are today nearly 10 million people residing within 100 miles of the proposed 11,292-acre park. This is a park that would have that incomparable advantage of accessibility. The people of Chicago are included in that 100-mile radius. In Chicago we are very mindful of the beauty of the Indiana dunes and we are concerned for their preservation. As Carl Sandburg has written:

> The Dunes are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and Yosemite is to California. They constitute a signature of time and eternity; once lost the loss would be irrevocable.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs concluded:

> Nowhere on the Great Lakes are water, waterfront, and hinterland more favorably combined for recreational use of millions.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. First, let me say that the gentleman's concern for the Indiana Dunes Park could be no less than my own, but I am equally concerned that Indiana have its port. The language which Members will find in the bill before us is language which I have included in H.R. 50 a bill which I introduced to provide for the port.

Also pending before the House is a bill which I introduced on the same day, H.R. 51, to provide for a National Dunes Lakeshore in Indiana on Lake Michigan.

As the gentleman knows, there has been an agreement between the proponents of the park and the proponents of the port which is in general, accepted by both sides.

I am happy to inform the gentleman that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs only yesterday announced that hearings will be held on the proposal for the Indiana Dunes Park. These hearings will be held October 2 and 3. They will be held in Indiana. They will be followed by further hearings in Washington, D.C., early next year.

I certainly urge the gentleman to continue his support of this very worthwhile project, and I hope he shares my concern that both the port and the park may go forward at the same time and that we may be able to say there will be a total development of the northern area of Indiana involved.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am pleased to know that he, too, supports the development of the dunes and to learn of his efforts to develop the dunes as a national park. I take it from what the gentleman said that if he will do his best to expedite passage of his bill making the dunes a national park. The gentleman from Indiana favors concurrent development of both projects. I agree with that.

I also favor concurrent development. That is why I am concerned that the development authorized in this bill of the Burns Harbor project shall not impede or prevent the development of the dunes as a national park. I am pleased, too, with assurances given me by members of the committee that they favor establishing the dunes as a national park and that this project will not interfere with the park.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. YATES. I had hoped that the gentleman would say that which he did. I am grateful to have the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that hearings will proceed expeditiously on the establishment of the National Park for the Sand Dunes of Indiana.

I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of this legislation and I desire to commend the great Committee on Public Works for the fine work which has been done in bringing this bill to the House.

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am reluctant to take more time, but since there will be no further amendments and probably no other discussion, I believe it fitting and proper, as well as justifiable, to say a word or two in behalf of our colleague, our respected and beloved friend, Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, for the tremendous amount of work he has put in on this bill.

Certainly the major share dollarwise, if that can be considered a measure—for what it is worth—has come under his jurisdiction. Two-thirds or three-fourths of this omnibus bill comes under the flood control subcommittee, of which he is chairman, the chairmanship of which he assumed for the first time in this session of the Congress.

Far above that, and far more important, is his dedication to the basic principles of conservation and the utilization and preservation of our resources wherever they may be in this great country.

Equally important is his personal interest in every municipality, every hamlet and city and rural area represented by any Member of the House. He devotes his time to the problems of each, knowing that the particular area involved for

that Congressman is the most important problem.

I wish to pay this tribute to him. I know I speak for a host of Members on both sides of the aisle in paying respects for a job done far beyond the call of duty in this body.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Public Works.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in my opening remarks I complimented the two gentlemen who put this rivers and harbors and flood control bill together [Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. JONES of Alabama].

I might say I do not know of any two men who worked harder to bring a bill before the House to extend the economy of this country than these two gentlemen. The greatest part of this bill is for the protection of lives and property. Certainly the history of rivers and harbors and flood control projects that have been built has proven that they have saved not only billions of dollars but many, many lives.

This bill that is before the House today is one of the best bills that has ever come before this House from the Committees on Public Works. It is an attempt to do the job necessary not only for the present but for many years to come.

I would like to pay tribute, also, to the other members of the subcommittee and the full committee who worked so hard and so dilligently and put in so many hours not only during the day but far into the night in order to bring out this legislation. I would like to say to this House that this is an example of a great team working under the leadership of great subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join in the remarks made by the distinguished chairman relating to our committee working its will and doing its best.

I might add an addendum—when given the opportunity to do so. In past years we have had omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bills where Democrats and Republicans, those on both sides of the aisle, stood shoulder to shoulder as far as leadership is concerned in trying to keep out of the bill projects that were admittedly bad, largely involving public versus private power and which should not be approved. Some of the most heated debate and divisions in this House have been on that one issue. I hope a similar decision will be made here. I understand a demand for a separate vote will be made on the Clark amendment. I hope this House will sustain the Clark amendment, which does what should be done on the Passamaquoddy-St. John project today to make a study and bring a report back to Congress next year. I say that because this project has been at no time studied separately. This is the proper procedure that should be followed in this case and which our committee and this House has constantly sustained.

Mr. Chairman, I have one other observation. I say this in all sincerity. I think it is most unfortunate that our committee was not given an equal opportunity to make its own decision and come up with a consensus on highway beautification. It was possible to do so and, as a matter of fact, the groundwork for it was laid two weekends ago when a concensus committee print was before the committee and so that we could come up with a consensus bill that would do the job relating to highway beautification but without the result of putting small business people who necessarily serve the highway traveling public and whose businesses are not located on the highways out of business.

I am talking about the little hotel and restaurant operators and the operators of recreational centers available to the traveling public in America. We need a bill to do the job but that would not put them out of business, which this proposal would do which was demanded by the White House and in effect reported by our committee. This proposal would have the effect of getting the Federal Government into zoning questions which are presently within the jurisdiction of local areas and cities. For the first time a demand was made by the White House on Wednesday of last week which was a demand for a proposal giving the Secretary power to set standards in areas zoned industrial and commercial which was not even included by the administration in its initial bill, and it was not proposed prior to that and thus subject to our hearings or subject to discussion in our hearings. I say to you all of us want to beautify highways but not at the expense of unduly putting people out of business and making depressed business in our country that are operated by people who are legitimately trying to serve the traveling public. We also do not want the traveling public denied the necessary information, services, and facilities for their food, shelter, repairs, and gasoline for automobiles, and information as to the whereabouts of recreational facilities which will be denied to them, in my opinion, under the bill as drafted.

I sincerely hope when that bill gets to the floor of the House we will be able to get proper and unhampered consideration of it.

I am sorry that similar action was not possible in the Public Works Committee on the beautification bill as on this omnibus public works bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that in the morning paper in Washington a grave injustice was done to one of our colleagues from the State of Texas and a grave injustice was done to me in quoting me as having made a personal reference to the gentleman from Texas, one which I did not make. I made no remarks that were anywhere close to that to which reference was made. I am sure the gentleman from Texas was present at all times on the floor. I am sure he is personally aware that I did not and would not make any comment of that kind.

I may thoroughly disagree with the gentleman with respect to a particular project in which he is very much interested, but I hope the day never comes when I shall have to resort to tactics of that kind in debate in this House of Representatives.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my very sincere and earnest gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for the comment he has just made and assure him that at no time did I believe that he had said that which was recorded in the paper this morning. I assumed that it was an error. And even if the gentleman had said such a thing, he would still be my friend.

In any event, I did not believe that he had said it and I am very grateful to him for the opportunity which he has graciously afforded me to make this statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas not only did I make no such comment publicly on this floor, or in any other place, but made no such comment privately at any time, or in any place.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300, a bill that has much significance in the 14th District of New Jersey which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

Much has been said on the floor today about "megalopolis" the name which we have coined for that great city which shall soon reach from Norfolk, Va., to Portland, Maine.

We have a great interest in megalopolis in northern New Jersey because we stand at the midpoint of this gigantic urban metropolis.

It is superfluous, Mr. Chairman, for me to dwell upon our recent water shortage which has posed a tremendous threat to our economic and physical well-being in the Northeastern United States.

Title I of this bill will set up a plan for a system of reservoirs to serve the Northeastern United States.

And, Mr. Chairman, the need for this comprehensive planning has been so well dramatized that I shall not waste the time of this House in explaining the need for a more adequate water supply in the Northeast. Every Member, whether he is from New Jersey or New York or California or Oregon, knows only too well the threat that another year of drought will pose to the northeastern part of the United States. If for no other reason than this, I would support this worthy bill.

I have said many times on the floor of the House that we are one nation. Economic sickness in one part of the United States means economic sickness in all parts of the Nation. It is for this reason that I supported the Appalachia program. I know in my heart that what is good for Kentucky and Tennessee is inevitably good for Hudson County, N.J. If the New York-New Jersey area is to suffer because of a water shortage, all parts of America in turn will feel the effects of our decline.

Mr. Chairman, for this reason, I urge all Members to support this much needed legislation.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, while approving the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill as a whole, I particularly approve that portion of the bill as contained on pages 215–217 of the report of the Committee on Public Works, dealing with the Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Mass. Since the conclusion of World War II tankers and bulk cargo carriers have been built much bigger, and these larger ships require deeper draft and old channel depths that at one time could accommodate all types of ships can no longer accommodate the new type vessels. Passage of this legislation will vitally affect the city of Quincy and the town of Weymouth in my 11th Congressional District of Massachusetts. The Town River is a tributary waterway of the port of Boston and lies entirely within the limits of the city of Quincy. The Town River is a tidal river, approximately 2 miles in length and empties into the Weymouth Fore River at Quincy Point. This river is chiefly used for transportation of petroleum products and the annual tonnage traffic increases each year. The Quincy Oil Co. is located about 1⅕ miles from the mouth of the river and has a 30 million gallon oil terminal, receiving over 50 tankers a year.

Present depths of the Town River will not accommodate the large tankers now in use and necessitates the use of barges to transport the fuel to the terminal from the tankers. Increasing the depth to 35 feet and widening the river will provide adequate channel depths and widths for larger ships to carry the prospective commerce on the waterway as well as the existing commerce.

Other oil companies as well as ship repair yards and the Quincy Electric Co. are located on the waterway in question. The latter will require the use of deep-draft traffic for receipt of fuel in line with construction of a new generating plant.

The Weymouth-Fore River is the location of the General Dynamics/Electric Boat Division Quincy yard which is one of the largest and most complete shipbuilding plants on the Atlantic coast. It is equipped with 12 launching ways and 3 mooring basins.

Also on this river is the Boston Edison Co.'s Edgar Station and the Cities Service Oil Co.

The project has an estimated Federal cost of $12.5 million and local participation of $1.5 million. The benefit from the completion of this project will be felt by these concerns and assist in the population, industrial, and commercial growth of the complete south shore area of which Quincy and Weymouth play a leading role.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill. I have always given my support to public works projects which protect and improve the vital natural resources of this country. While it may be argued that some of these measures are extravagant and not needed, on the whole the overwhelming majority of these projects have been carefully studied by the Committee on Public Works and have received their stamp of approval as worthwhile projects for the expenditure of taxpayers' money. I concur in this conclusion. During debate on the bill, I supported amendments which would delete or cut those projects which were wasteful or questionable.

The people of my District are hopeful that two of our vital projects will get the go-ahead in next year's public works authorization and appropriation bills. The Kokosing project has already been authorized and funds have been advanced for initial work. We need to allocate the necessary funds for this vital project so the people of Knox County and Mount Vernon, Ohio, will be afforded the flood control protection they so badly need.

In Licking County, the Corps of Engineers currently has a project which is still under study. They are nearing completion and we certaintly hope that it will be authorized as soon as possible so this work can proceed. This, too, is a flood control project and vital to the growth of Newark and Licking County. No work of my office has been more intensive or more rewarding than my efforts on these two projects.

Both of these areas have been hit by disastrous floods which caused many millions of dollars worth of damage. In consulting with the members of the committee, I have found widespread support for the Licking project when it clears the survey stage. Inasmuch as the Licking project has not proceeded beyond the survey stage, nothing can be done here today. My constituents are patient people and yet they all feel as I do that the time for action is now. I hope that the Corps of Engineers will give us the final OK on the Licking project and the Bureau of the Budget will include an adequate appropriation for the Kokosing project in their 1967 requests. In this way, we can take a positive step forward.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300 and particularly in support of the projects on the Neuse River Basin: The Falls Dam and Reservoir and the project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity.

Last fall following unusually heavy rainfall in the upper Neuse Basin, I flew by helicopter over the Neuse in Wayne and Lenoir Counties in the vicinity of Goldsboro and Seven Springs, N.C., and the flood damage was almost indescribable. It was obvious that it came from the upper reaches of the river, and the Wilmington district office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reported that had the Falls Dam been constructed at that time, the great majority of the damage would have been prevented.

Cost-benefit ratios as shown in reports of the Corps of Engineers are cold statistics and are hard to visualize in terms of evacuated homes with water standing in them several feet deep, of isolated families clustered outside their houses completely surrounded by water looking up and waving at a helicopter; or hundreds of acres of unharvested corn under water; flooded pastures with cattle in tight little knots on a high spot, or a gigantic industrial complex like the Carolina Power & Light Co. steam generation plant at Quaker Neck with the waters submerging its coal piles and lapping ominously around the footings of the generator itself.

The cost-benefit ratio for the Falls Dam project is a favorable one, but I am confident that there is not a Member of this body who, if he had seen what I saw along the Neuse Basin in the Goldsboro-Seven Springs vicinity last fall, would not only agree that the project is justified, but would be an enthusiastic supporter of it.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity is a different type of proposal and provides for the construction of a dam with a break in the center. It would retard and spread out the flow of tidal waters forced upriver by heavy hurricane tides and winds. It is a relatively new concept and I am advised that before a request is made for funding of construction of the project, the Corps of Engineers will first request funds for a model study to prove completely the feasibility of the construction.

Certainly the authorization of the project to the end that the model study can be funded is justified. As these remarks are being made, interests along the gulf coast are still trying to evaluate the damage caused by Hurricane Betsy and Hurricane Carol is meandering about in the Carribean trying to make up her mind where to go.

In recent years, it has not been a question of whether New Bern and vicinity would be hit by hurricane winds and tides, but rather a question of when.

Both of these projects are worthy of being included in this bill.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Chairman, I note with some degree of curiosity that this bill—which I have often heard described as pork barrel legislation—authorizes a total appropriation of $4 million for the State of Michigan, which has more coastline, more harbors, and handles as much shipping as any State in the Union. At the same time, it authorizes more than six times as much for the construction of one harbor in Indiana, at Burns ditch, which will be of immediate benefit to one steel company. If steel were used to make pork barrels, I could understand how the legislation got its name.

I notice, too, that Texas will receive about 26 times as much as Michigan, three-quarters of which is a down payment on developing a port for the city of Fort Worth. Both Kalamazoo and Battle Creek, in my district, are on an equally navigable river, and for less money we might well be able to make an ocean port—accessible through the Great Lakes—for them. And yet this obviously worthwhile proposal was not even considered.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this type of public works bill may be of value when our Nation is not on the verge of inflation. Pump priming may have its virtues when the pump is dry. But today I feel we may need to be more concerned that the well will go dry, particularly in view of the impending increases in our defense appropriations. I cannot consider the bill, as a whole, timely nor

a good investment of our national funds. So I vote against it. These programs would be well curtailed and delayed.

Should the Federal Government indeed have an excess $1.9 billion setting around, I would prefer it be given to the States on a per capita basis, in the nature of a tax sharing scheme.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, over the years I think I have a pretty good record in support of flood control and the conservation of soil and water resources. I know of nothing more necessary and no responsibility greater than to do the things we know we must to preserve these God-given resources for the benefit of the future.

It is now being realized in other parts of the country where water has been plentiful that the problem of water shortage and water quality can be as important as survival itself. We from the more arid areas have long been aware of the problem because we have learned it from hard experience.

It is trite to say that water is essential to all other things, and to neglect doing those things which we must is to shirk a responsibility and close our eyes to the progress and development of our country.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, in support of the record I have for projects which have these things as their goal and purpose. There are many good projects in this bill. There are some of highly doubtful merit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I face a very difficult choice involving several big items included in the measure before us. First, it seems to me the project on the St. Johns River in Maine is neither justified nor needed. You have heard the debate and the reasons for the weakness of this proposal. Other things aside, it just does not seem right to me that a $227 million project should not have some local contribution, and this has none.

Then, Mr. Chairman, of course, even more difficult is to oppose any part or feature of a great project in my own State of Texas. Without hesitancy, I would vote for flood control, municipal water, recreation or any of the other benefits coming from the development of the Trinity River, but I cannot, in judgment and conscience, support the canalization of the Trinity River to make it navigable from the gulf to Fort Worth, Tex.

I am well aware of the contention of my colleagues that this feature will be further studied and that it will be necessary to return to the Congress for funds to carry out this part of the proposal. I do not see it this way at all, and there is no doubt in my mind that the authorization contained in this bill is final and obligatory to undertake this development, which is really undefined in many respects, and especially as to cost.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that it affords me no pleasure at all to oppose my respected and esteemed colleagues who are convinced of the worthiness of this project, but I have long been committed against the navigational aspect of the Trinity River. For the reasons of pure economics, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, and the lack of feasibility, I simply must oppose this feature of it. Otherwise I enthusiastically support the proposition.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, let me say that I support S. 2300, as reported by the House Committee on Public Works, with the exception of the three projects set forth in the supplemental views of which I am a coauthor. Generally speaking, this legislation is good legislation and I would hope that we could correct those phases of the legislation with which I disagree. However, at this time I want to make a few remarks concerning the Trinity River project.

I think it is well that I do so because the subcommittee on which I have the honor of serving as ranking minority member, recommended this project to the full committee. I am frank to admit that, initially, I had serious misgivings about this project, particularly in view of the position of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Army, however, I feel that we have considerably improved that phase of the legislation by writing into the bill and in the committee report, provisions whereby there will be an appropriate restudy based on current criteria and, in addition thereto, there will be an opportunity for this Congress, as well as the Public Works Committee, to review that project at such time as later monetary authorizations are necessary.

I want to pay particular tribute here, Mr. Chairman, to the work of the gentleman from Texas, Congressman RAY ROBERTS, who was quite instrumental, not only in seeing that this project was approved by both the subcommittee and full committee of the House Public Works Committee, but whose persuasive and logical arguments in behalf of this project convinced me that, in the long run, the project will be in the best interest of our Nation.

During my service on the House Committee on Public Works, I have found that Congressman ROBERTS has been one of the most dedicated, diligent and effective members serving thereon. He not only has been a strong supporter of the Trinity River project and one of the principle reasons why the committee approved it, but he has been equally an effective spokesman for navigational development on the Red and Sabine Rivers in Texas.

While these particular projects have not, as yet, been submitted to the committee, I feel sure that, as a result of his diligent efforts in their behalf, they will soon appear in an omnibus bill and I, again, want to commend Congressman ROBERTS for, not only his tremendous and effective efforts in behalf of the Trinity River project, but in behalf of all of his work on our committee. He truly represents his district ably and well.

And, at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the House's attention to the extremely effective efforts of the distinguished Senator from Texas, JOHN G. TOWER, in behalf of this project.

Senator TOWER has conferred with me and other members of the committee on numerous occasions, strongly urging support of this project and his logical, persuasive and aggressive arguments in behalf of this project to me and to others as well, I am sure, contributed immensely to the position of the Public Works Committee in favoring the authorization of the Trinity River project.

The Trinity River project has long been a bipartisan project supported by most Texans of all political persuasions, who are interested in the development of the entire Trinity River watershed. This was summed up in a statement presented to the House Public Works Committee by Senator JOHN TOWER. In recognizing the contributions made toward the Trinity River project by Texans of all political and economic persuasions, the Senator said:

> Many men have dreamed and worked for many years to make the Trinity River project a reality.
>
> I want the House Public Works Committee to know that I share that dream and support efforts aimed at seeing it become a reality.
>
> As a citizen of our State, and as a representative of our people in the National Congress, I want to ask the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives to look with favor on the entire Trinity River project.
>
> I shall not here attempt to argue the merits of the Trinity River project. Others have done this ably and well over the years. The technical and economic considerations have been explored fully by persons well-trained and qualified for their tasks. I merely wish to state that I have carefully considered factors on both sides of the argument, and I am convinced that the economy of our State and Nation would receive benefits far in excess of the costs involved.

As further evidence that the people of Texas regard this as a project to which many people have contributed, and in which no single person can claim all the credit for its progress thus far, it is worthwhile to note the response to Senator TOWER'S statement to the House committee.

Mr. L. H. Armstrong, traffic general foreman of General Dynamics in Fort Worth, said this:

> I want to express my sincere appreciation for the statement you presented to the House Public Works Committee in support of the plan for development of the Trinity River Basin.
>
> As a member of the Texas delegation which appeared at the recent hearing before the committee, I was greatly impressed, and I am sure the committee was, by the statements presented by the many Texas Members of Congress in support of the Trinity improvement plan.

From Mr. J. Lee Johnson III, executive vice president and general manager of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, came this statement:

> I had the pleasure to be one of the delegates representing Texas before the House Public Works Committee at its recent hearing on the comprehensive plan for development of the Trinity River Basin, and I want to express to you my sincere thanks and appreciation for the statement you presented in support of this plan.

From Mr. Clyde Skeen, president of Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., of Dallas, came this statement:

> It is very gratifying to see the support you are giving to the comprehensive plan of development for the Trinity River Basin of Texas.

From Roy Appleton, Jr., general manager of the Denton Record-Chronicle, came this response:

As a member of the Texas delegation that appeared recently before the House Public Works Committee at its hearing in regard to the development of the Trinity River Basin, I was most impressed by the work that has been done on this project by you and the other members of the Texas congressional delegation. As was pointed out by you and others at the hearing, this project has the wholehearted support of all Texans, and the time for action is now.

From Mr. W. Lamar Hamilton, of the Palestine Herald-Press, came this statement:

The interest you showed in our reception and dinner of August 11, was most appreciated, and the statement you presented on August 12, to the House Public Works Committee was a masterpiece of factual information.

And from Mr. W. W. Lynch, president of the Texas Power & Light Co., came this statement:

I have heard many expressions of appreciation and I want to add mine with respect to your testimony before the House in regard to the Trinity River development program. You made a very important contribution.

These statements give ample evidence of the broad nature of support for the Trinity River development project, both in Texas and among those who represent Texas in the National Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to again commend the distinguished Senator from Texas for his very diligent and effective efforts in behalf of this project. I am sure that, without his assistance, it may never have been authorized by this Congress.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, the Trinity River Basin project, by any standard, is a huge undertaking. It is enormous in size, cost, vision, ambition, benefit, and merit. When completed, it will have cost $1 billion and will be a fitting complement to the many other greatly meritorious and costly, multimillion-dollar projects which in our time have become a measure of our Nation's greatness. I refer to the Arkansas River, Puget Sound, the Missouri River, the Intracoastal Canal, the Mississippi River, the Cross Florida Canal, New York Harbor, and many others of which we can be and are justly proud.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, if there is anything more tempting to a Member of Congress than voting for a public works project in his own district, it is the temptation to vote against a public works project in the other Member's district. Yet, yielding to either temptation would be irrational and destructive of the Nation's well-being if our judgments were not based strictly on the question of the merits of each individual public works project. It is with this in mind that I wish to examine the Trinity River Basin project.

This great river basin encompasses some 17,845 square miles of land and stretches some 360 miles from above Fort Worth, past Dallas, Corsicana, Palestine, and Liberty on down to the gulf coast near Houston. The basin is more than 100 miles wide above Fort Worth and furnishes livelihood and residence to 3 percent of the total population of our country. It has more people than are to be found in any one of 32 States of the United States.

The potential of the Trinity River Basin has long been recognized by the people of this great area as well as the people of the Nation. There are presently seven Corps of Engineers projects in various stages of planning and construction—four completed, two under construction, and one in planning stage; several local flood-protection projects are in existence, and quite a few others have been authorized. State, local, and private funds in the amount of $500 million have been spent or will be spent—$269 million spent, and $256 million pledged to be spent by reliable State, local, and private sources. Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that would distinguish this great project from the other great projects throughout our country, it would be the investment of such large sums of State, local, and private funds.

The Trinity River Basin project is a great and worthwhile project. Like all meritorious public works projects, it is an investment in the future of our great Nation; and, more important, it is an expression of the confidence we have in ourselves and the future of our country.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to direct the attention of the House to two very necessary provisions in S. 2300 for the development of Calumet Harbor and River, Ill., and Ind., as authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved October 23, 1962.

The Calumet River is a connecting channel between Lake Michigan proper and the extensive harbor facilities of Lake Calumet. It provides the only link between the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Cal-Sag Channel connection with the vast inland waterway system that serves the State of Illinois, the Midwest, and the whole center section of this country. It required deepening subsequent to the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and it still remains to be deepened. The public and private facilities located along the Calumet River, which represents an expenditure of tens of millions of dollars cannot be rendered fully capable of meeting their potential until the dredging of the channel to full seaway depth is completed.

In order to permit dredging to full project depth of 27 feet, the New York, Chicago & St. Louis—Nickel Plate—Railroad bride and the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad bridge must be strengthened to withstand the channel deepening. Therefore, I am pleased that S. 2300 modifies the River and Harbor Act of 1962 in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers to provide this necessary protection for both bridges.

This development is overdue in that the full potential to the Chicago metropolitan area of the St. Lawrence Seaway and its connecting waterway with the Mississippi River will not be fully utilized until the navigation problems on the Calumet River have been completely solved.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, it has been my honor to serve in the Congress for 17 years. I have never served on any committee or set through any hearings or heard any deliberations presided over in a more superb manner than by my friends, the Honorable BOB JONES, of Alabama, and the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota. These gentlemen presided with patience, understanding, and devotion to the welfare of our country beyond the call of duty. It was an inspiration to serve on the subcommittee with these great Americans. This bill before the House today is a result of their tact, diplomacy, fairness, and dedication to the general welfare.

Mr. Chairman, our beloved and able chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, GEORGE FALLON, was always in the background, guiding, and counseling all of us. He is one of the greatest committee chairmen in the history of the Congress.

This bill and the projects it creates will be a monument to the genius of Mr. FALLON, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES, the senior members of the Public Works Committee, and an able, dedicated, and concientious staff.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the bill is considered as read.

The question is on the committee substitute to the Senate bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 588, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by Mr. CLARK on page 41, lines 4 through 12, inclusively.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARK: Substitute the following language for the language on page 41, lines 4 through 12, inclusively:

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the St. John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project, which survey shall include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy, and to submit a report thereon to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966."

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 207, nays 185, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

YEAS—207

Abbitt	Erlenborn	Moorhead
Adair	Findley	Morgan
Addabbo	Fisher	Morse
Andrews, Glenn	Flood	Murray
	Fogarty	Natcher
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fountain	Nedzi
	Fulton, Pa.	Nelsen
Arends	Fuqua	O'Neill, Mass.
Ashbrook	Giaimo	Pelly
Ashmore	Goodell	Perkins
Baldwin	Grabowski	Philbin
Bates	Gray	Pike
Battin	Griffin	Pirnie
Belcher	Griffiths	Poff
Bell	Gross	Quie
Berry	Grover	Quillen
Betts	Gubser	Randall
Boland	Gurney	Reid, Ill.
Bray	Haley	Reid, N.Y.
Brock	Hall	Reifel
Broomfield	Halleck	Reinecke
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanley	Rhodes, Ariz.
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Rhodes, Pa.
Buchanan	Hardy	Rivers, Alaska
Burke	Harsha	Robison
Burleson	Harvey, Ind.	Rogers, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey, Mich.	Rooney, Pa.
Cahill	Hays	Roudebush
Callaway	Henderson	Rumsfeld
Carey	Horton	Satterfield
Casey	Huot	St Germain
Cederberg	Hutchinson	St. Onge
Chamberlain	Ichord	Saylor
Chelf	Irwin	Schneebeli
Clancy	Jarman	Schweiker
Clark	Jennings	Secrest
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Pa.	Selden
	Jonas	Shipley
Clawson, Del	Jones, Mo.	Shriver
Cleveland	Keith	Sikes
Collier	Kelly	Skubitz
Conable	Keogh	Slack
Conte	King, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.
Cooley	Kornegay	Smith, N.Y.
Corbett	Kunkel	Smith, Va.
Craley	Laird	Stanton
Cramer	Langen	Steed
Cunningham	Latta	Stratton
Curtin	Lennon	Talcott
Curtis	Lipscomb	Taylor
Daddario	Love	Teague, Calif.
Dague	McClory	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Tuck
de la Garza	McDade	Utt
Delaney	McMillan	Vivian
Dent	MacGregor	Walker, Miss.
Denton	Mahon	Watkins
Derwinski	Mailliard	Watson
Devine	Marsh	Watts
Dickinson	Martin, Ala.	Whalley
Dole	Martin, Mass.	White, Tex.
Donohue	Martin, Nebr.	Whitener
Dorn	Mathias	Whitten
Dowdy	Matthews	Widnall
Downing	May	Williams
Dulski	Michel	Wilson, Bob
Duncan, Tenn.	Minshall	Wolff
Dwyer	Mize	Wyatt
Edwards, Ala.	Monagan	Wydler
Ellsworth	Moore	Younger

NAYS—185

Abernethy	Callan	Farbstein
Adams	Cameron	Fascell
Albert	Carter	Feighan
Anderson, Tenn.	Celler	Flynt
	Clevenger	Foley
Annunzio	Cohelan	Ford, William D.
Ashley	Conyers	
Aspinall	Corman	Fraser
Bandstra	Culver	Friedel
Barrett	Daniels	Fulton, Tenn.
Beckworth	Davis, Ga.	Gallagher
Bennett	Dawson	Garmatz
Bingham	Dingell	Gathings
Blatnik	Dow	Gettys
Boggs	Duncan, Oreg.	Gibbons
Bolling	Dyal	Gilbert
Brademas	Edmondson	Gilligan
Brooks	Edwards, Calif.	Gonzalez
Brown, Calif.	Evans, Colo.	Green, Oreg.
Burton, Calif.	Everett	Green, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Evins, Tenn.	Greigg
Cabell	Fallon	Grider
Hagan, Ga.	Madden	Rostenkowski
Hagen, Calif.	Matsunaga	Roush
Halpern	Meeds	Roybal
Hamilton	Mills	Ryan
Hanna	Minish	Scheuer
Hansen, Iowa	Mink	Schisler
Hansen, Wash.	Moeller	Schmidhauser
Hathaway	Morris	Scott
Hawkins	Morrison	Sickles
Hébert	Moss	Sisk
Hechler	Multer	Smith, Iowa
Helstoski	Murphy, Ill.	Stafford
Howard	Murphy, N.Y.	Stalbaum
Hull	Nix	Stubblefield
Hungate	O'Hara, Mich.	Sullivan
Jacobs	O'Konski	Sweeney
Joelson	Olsen, Mont.	Teague, Tex.
Johnson, Calif.	Olson, Minn.	Tenzer
Jones, Ala.	O'Neal, Ga.	Thompson, N.J.
Karsten	Ottinger	Todd
Karth	Patman	Trimble
Kastenmeier	Patten	Tunney
Kee	Pepper	Tupper
King, Calif.	Pickle	Tuten
King, Utah	Poage	Udall
Kirwan	Pool	Ullman
Kluczynski	Powell	Van Deerlin
Krebs	Price	Vanik
Landrum	Pucinski	Vigorito
Leggett	Purcell	Waggonner
Long, La.	Race	Walker, N. Mex.
Long, Md.	Redlin	Weltner
McCarthy	Reuss	White, Idaho
McDowell	Rivers, S.C.	Willis
McFall	Roberts	Wilson, Charles H.
McGrath	Rodino	
McVicker	Rogers, Colo.	Wright
Macdonald	Rogers, Fla.	Yates
Machen	Ronan	Young
Mackay	Rooney, N.Y.	Zablocki
Mackie	Rosenthal	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Roncalio

NOT VOTING—39

Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Brien
Andrews, George W.	Frelinghuysen	O'Hara, Ill.
	Harris	Passman
Ayres	Herlong	Resnick
Baring	Hicks	Roosevelt
Bolton	Holifield	Senner
Bonner	Holland	Springer
Bow	Hosmer	Staggers
Burton, Utah	Johnson, Okla.	Stephens
Colmer	Lindsay	Thomas
Diggs	McEwen	Thompson, Tex.
Farnsley	Miller	Toll
Farnum	Morton	
Fino	Mosher	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Roncalio for, with Mr. Hicks against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma against.

Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. Senner against.

Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Farnum against.

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Farnsley against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holland with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Springer.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Thomas with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. George W. Andrews.

Messrs. ABERNETHY, POOL, O'KONSKI, and MOELLER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. COOLEY, HANLEY, and BROOMFIELD changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HICKS]. If he were present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee substitute for the Senate bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. POWELL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1061)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: 'That this Act may be cited as the 'Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.'

"AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I—YOUTH PROGRAMS

"Job Corps—Displacement of workers

"SEC. 2. Section 103 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after 'SEC. 103.' the following new sentence: 'The Director of the Office shall prescribe regulations to prevent programs under this part from displacing presently employed workers or the impairment of existing contracts for services.'

"Job Corps—Payments to certain individuals or organizations prohibited

"SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of section 103 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the period and adding after the word 'terminated' the following: ': *Provided, however,* That the Director shall make no payments to any individual or to any organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Corps.'

"Job Corps—Cuban refugees

"SEC. 4. Section 104(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'For purposes of this subsection, any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered a permanent resident of the United States.'

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Sept. 24, 1965
For actions of Sept. 23, 1965
89th-1st; No. 176

CONTENTS

Air pollution.....16	Flood control.....3,24	River Basin.....21
Appropriations.....1,27	Food shortage.....2	Rivers and harbors.....3
Conservation.....22	Foreign aid.....1	Spending.....10
Contracts.....4	Labor standards.....4	Stockpile.....9
Cost-of-living.....15	Legal aid.....17	Tariffs.....25
Credit.....26	Legislative program..11,20	Trade expansion.....19
Elmer Thomas.....6	Loans.....13,23	Trade fairs.....7,11
Exhibitions.....7,11	Lumber.....14	Water problems.....5
Farm bill.....18	Poverty.....8,11,12	

HIGHLIGHTS: House adopted conference report on poverty bill. House passed bill to expand various FHA loan authorizations. Senate passed foreign-aid appropriation bill. Sen. McGovern spoke on world food problems.

SENATE

1. FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed, 59-22, with amendments this bill, H. R. 10871. Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 23917-8, 23926-49, 23957-87

2. FOOD SHORTAGE. Sen. McGovern spoke on the world food problem, stating that it is important now and will become the number 1 problem of the future. Sen. Dodd commended the speech, giving supplemental information. pp. 23918-24

3. RIVERS-HARBORS; FLOOD CONTROL. Conferees were appointed on the rivers-and-harbors and flood-control bill, S. 2300. House conferees have not yet been appointed. pp. 23949-57

4. CONTRACTS; LABOR STANDARDS. A subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee approved H. R. 10238, to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies. p. D958

5. WATER PROBLEMS. S. Con. Res. 55, to express the sense of Congress regarding certain water problems confronting the U. S. and Canada, was transferred from the Foreign Relations Committee to the Public Works Committee. p. 24009

6. ELMER THOMAS. Sen. Monroney paid tribute to former Sen. Elmer Thomas, who was Chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee. p. 24009

7. EXHIBITIONS. Sen. Lausche criticized S. 2167, providing for U. S. participation in the HemisFair to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968. pp. 24008-9

8. POVERTY. Sen. Murphy inserted an article criticizing the Job Corps budget. p. 24001

Sen. Williams, Del., criticized an expenditure item of the Job Corps. p. 24003

9. STOCKPILE. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10516, to authorize disposal of vegetable tannin extracts in the national stockpile (H. Rept. 778), and with amendment H. R. 6852, to authorize disposal of abaca (H. Rept. 779). p. 23987

10. SPENDING. Sen. Dirksen inserted a table showing 50 new authorizations and the amounts of resulting costs which he estimates. p. 23962

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the poverty bill will be considered today, the Senate will then adjourn until Tues., and the HemisFair bill will then be taken up. pp. 23964, 24009

HOUSE

12. POVERTY. Adopted the conference report on H. R. 8283, to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. pp. 24021-22

13. LOANS. Passed with amendment S. 1766, the FHA loan expansion bill, after substituting the language of H. R. 10232 which was passed earlier, by a vote of 325 to 10, with an amendment by Rep. Dingell to require that proposed projects comply with State standards of pollution control (pp. 24051-69). See digest 161 for provisions of this bill.

14. LUMBER. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10198, to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916 (H. Rept. 1088). pp. 24116-17

15. COST-OF-LIVING. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 569, requiring a cost-of-living survey to be made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics before the cost-of-living allowance for Federal employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands be reduced (H. Rept. 1091). p. 24117

16. AIR POLLUTION. Agreed to a resolution for the consideration of S. 306, to amend the Clean Air Act and to provide for the establishment of a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory. pp. 24045-48

17. LEGAL AID. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee approved for full committee action S. 1758, amended, to provide for the right of persons to be

Senator from New York would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 269 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Bartlett	Ellender	Morton
Bible	Fong	Mundt
Burdick	Fulbright	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Robertson
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Symington
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Talmadge
Cooper	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Cotton	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Montoya	Young, Ohio
Eastland	Morse	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Hill	Murphy
Allott	Holland	Muskie
Hass	Inouye	Nelson
Bayh	Jackson	Neuberger
Boggs	Javits	Pastore
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Carlson	Kuchel	Proxmire
Case	Lausche	Ribicoff
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Russell, Ga.
Dodd	Long, La.	Russell, S.C.
Dominick	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Ervin	Mansfield	Smathers
Fannin	McGee	Smith
Harris	McNamara	Stennis
Hart	Metcalf	Thurmond
Hartke	Miller	Tydings
Hayden	Monroney	Yarborough
Hickenlooper	Moss	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Bennett	McCarthy	Simpson
Brewster	McIntyre	Sparkman
Curtis	Mondale	Tower
Gore	Pearson	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 5842. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961; and

H.R. 9221. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby recognizes that assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89–80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States. This plan may provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of (1) a system of major reservoirs to be located within those river basins of the Northeastern United States which drain into the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into the Atlantic Ocean north of the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into Lake Ontario, and those that drain into the Saint Lawrence River, (2) major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest, and (3) major purification facilities. Such plans shall provide for appropriate financial participation by the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other local interests.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain those reservoirs, conveyance facilities, and purification facilities, which are recommended in the plan prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and which are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of the plan established in accordance with this section.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single and multiple purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such projects is less than $10,000,000. No appropriation shall be made to construct, operate, or maintain any such project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report of such proposed project, including all relevant data and all costs.

(b) Any water resource development project authorized to be constructed by this section shall be subject to the same requirements of local cooperation as it would be if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10,000,000 or more.

SEC. 202. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law, the authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 203. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 204. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

Saint John River Basin

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the Saint John River, Maine, separate and apart from

the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project, which survey shall include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy, and to submit a report thereon to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966.

Housatonic River Basin

The projects for flood protection on the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers at Derby and Danbury, Connecticut, are hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

New England-Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

Long Island Sound area

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

Hudson River Basin

The project for flood protection at Yonkers, Saw Mill River, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 258, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,924,000.

New York-Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

Elizabeth River Basin, New Jersey

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

Rahway River Basin, New Jersey

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

Neuse River Basin

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

Middle Atlantic Coastal Area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

Flint River Basin

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

Central and Southern Florida Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

South Atlantic Coastal Area

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

Phillippi Creek Basin, Florida

The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

Lower Mississippi River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $181,109,000, and the authorization for the lower Mississippi River project is hereby increased accordingly, except that (1) any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, Floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928, (2) the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, (3) the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and (4) the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the Saint Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be the same as is required by paragraph (q) under the heading "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The project for the Saint Francis River, Missouri and Arkansas, within Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,372,000.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army in that document shall apply with respect to the Seabrook lock feature of the project. The estimated cost is $56,235,000.

Ouachita River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

Red River Basin

The proviso in the paragraph under the center heeading "Red River Basin" in the Act of December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 840, Public Law 88–253) relating to the Waurika project, Oklahoma, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to acquire lands and interests therein required for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir as described in Senate Document Numbered 33, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $418,000, whenever the Secretary of the Interior approves the establishment of such a refuge.".

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

The project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, as authorized in the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1187), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway crossing Pat Mayse Reservoir to replace the present FM Highway 1499 across Sanders Creek, at an estimated cost of $310,000. Such crossing shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

Gulf of Mexico

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, White Oak

Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,004,000.

Rio Grande Basin

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

Arkansas River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 270, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

The project for flood protection at Little Rock, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 55, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $363,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

The project for flood protection on Crutcho Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 47, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,801,000.

The project for Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colorado, House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-fourth Congress, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in paragraph 2(a) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 1954, published in said document, local interests shall maintain the channel of Purgatoire River through the city of Trinidad. The conditions set forth in paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of said report shall be applicable to the project.

The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

Missouri River Basin

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000, except that such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, shall be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the James River and tributaries, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 266, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,083,000.

The project for flood control on the Fishing River and tributaries, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,260,000.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $218,009,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of Linneus Reservoir on Locust Creek, St. Catherine Reservoir on East Yellow Creek, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, nor hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonsburg Reservoir on Grand River.

The project for flood protection on the Platte River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 262, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,889,000.

The project for flood protection on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297; Public Law 85–500) is hereby modified to waive the requirement that local interests contribute in cash 2.16 per centum of the actual construction cost of all items of work provided by the United States.

Ohio River Basin

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Hocking River, Ohio, in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,520,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially

in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Rowlesbury Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided,* That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further,* That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further,* That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000. Prior to initiation of construction the Secretary of the Army shall prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

Red River of the north basin

The project for flood protection on the Roseau River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,550,000.

Upper Mississippi River Basin

The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000, if local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for Ames Dam and Reservoir, Skunk River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 267, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,893,000.

The projects for flood protection at Marshalltown and Waterloo on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $17,570,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

The project on the Des Moines River for flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, House Document Numbered 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified to eliminate the requirement recommended in paragraph 10(a)(2) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 13, 1943, that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains.

Great Lakes Basin

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

Little Colorado River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

Gila River Basin

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000, except that the development of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

Eel River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

Sacramento River Basin

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

The project for the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir with supplemental channel improvements, Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 259, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

San Francisco Bay area

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

Whitewater River Basin

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000. The estimated cost is $3,442,000.

Santa Ana River Basin

The project for flood protection on Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,750,000.

San Diego River Basin

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000, except that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work done by such interests on such project after the date of enactment of this Act, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Columbia River Basin

The projects for the Lower Grande Ronde and Catherine Creek dams and reservoirs, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, Oregon, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 280, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,440,000. The Chief of En-

gineers shall construct, operate, and maintain such projects.

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

The project for acquisition of additional lands for waterfowl management at John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $706,000, except that the parcels of land, in Oregon, between the Columbia River and the management area boundary within sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of township 4 north, range 25 east, Willamette meridian, as shown on plate 1 of Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, estimated at 611.02 acres, shall not be part of the management area, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase such additional lands in sections 22, 27, 29, and 30, township 5 north, range 26 east, Willamette meridian, outside the present indicated management area boundary on plate 1, as he determines necessary to replace the lands so excluded.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. In the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, the Federal Government shall not construct such local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, until said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that (1) it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and (2) that such reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. Such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-rang economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. That the project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minnesota, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–500, 72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work done by such interests on such project after April 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coastlines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana (water supply).

Boyer River, Iowa.

Keokuk, Iowa.

Mississippi River, north of Dubuque, Iowa.

Black Hawk Creek, Iowa.

Mount Vernon, Indiana.

Orange Lake Basin, Florida.

Mayfield Creek, Kentucky.

Hatchie River and Tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.

Spoon River, Illinois.

Grand (Neosho) River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Verdigris River, Kansas.

Verdigris River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Sanderson, Texas.

Abbeville, South Carolina.

All streams which drain directly to Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, California.

Big Mineral Creek, Texas, particularly with reference to construction of a highway bridge.

Irondequoit Creek, New York, and tributaries, including Allens Creek, New York.

Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California to determine advisability of protection work against storm and tidal waves.

SEC. 209. Notwithstanding the first proviso in section 201 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes", approved May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), the authorization in section 204 of such Act of projects for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Washington, shall expire on June 10, 1970, unless local interests shall before such date furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required local cooperation in such project will be furnished.

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of their contract numbered DA–41–443–eng–939 with Hill County, Texas, which are subject to flooding; such roads being a part of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, at an estimated cost of $130,000.

SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, subject to the provisions of this section, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the tract of land lying above elevation 454 feet mean sea level now occupied by such Society at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under a lease executed by the Secretary of the Army and dated February 10, 1958.

(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be made upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and upon such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States. In determining the fair market value of the property, the Secretary shall exclude the value of any improvements made by or at the expense of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(c) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized by this section shall be borne by the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(d) Title to the property authorized to be conveyed by this section shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 212. The authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, West Virginia, hereafter shall be known and designated as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which the authorized Justice Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

SEC. 213. In recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Washington, by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, there is hereby authorized to be appropri-

ated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such project and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by him approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood-control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army. Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the project for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890). Unless construction of the project is undertaken within three years from the date of enactment of this section, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

SEC. 214. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with the State of New York, political subdivisions thereof, and appropriate agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins within the State of New York, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate participation by the Department of the Army in carrying out such plans.

SEC. 215. The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities at reservoir areas", approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509), is hereby amended by striking out "before November 1, 1956,".

SEC. 216. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, an investigation and study of San Francisco Bay, California, including San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto, with a view toward determining the feasibility of, and extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes.

SEC. 217. The Secretary of the Army shall pay to any bona fide lessee or permittee owning improvements, which are or which were totally situated or partially situated on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of such improvements, which have been or will be rendered inoperative or be otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kansas, as determined by the Secretary, or by the United States District Court for the District of Kansas on which is conferred jurisdiction for this purpose. In no case shall the owner of such improvements receive dual compensation for any part of said improvements as a result of this section or otherwise. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide the funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this section from any moneys appropriated for the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project.

SEC. 218. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $3,000,000.

SEC. 219. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to accept orders from other Federal departments and agencies for work or services and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

SEC. 220. Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500,000".

SEC. 221. The Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.

SEC. 222. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

TITLE III—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 301. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

Navigation

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

Rondout Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 274, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,090,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers—Removal of Drift in the Washington Metropolitan Area: House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Documents Numbered 226 and 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,569,000. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, shall include facilities to mitigate damages to presently improved areas southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of $40,000. The Chief of Engineers may include additional facilities to mitigate damages to additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge if he determines them to be necessary and justified, at an estimated additional cost of $60,000. All such facilities to mitigate damages shall be maintained by local interests.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel From the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000. In order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $570,000, except that the modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, contained in letter of April 5, 1965, from the Department of the Army to the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, shall apply with respect to recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 269, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,840,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

The project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 480) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct a steel bulkhead at cut numbered 1. Local interests shall contribute to the cost of the project an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of this project that would have been required for cut numbered 1, but for this modification.

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-either Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. In view of the willingness of the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a deep-draft public harbor in that vicinity, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such a harbor according to a design agreed upon by the Secretary of the Army and the State of Indiana, subject to the following conditions: (1) The amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with the State of Indiana, and approved by the President; (2) such amount shall not exceed the cost to the United States of constructing an equivalent Federal harbor at the same site; (3) prior to the time that the monetary contribution, or any part thereof, is made available to the State of Indiana the Secretary of the Army and the State of Indiana shall have entered into an agreement providing for the operation of the harbor essentially as it would be operated by the Secretary of the Army had it been constructed as a Federal harbor; (4) no fees or tolls shall be charged for entrance to the outer harbor; (5) any other fees or charges collected by the State of Indiana shall not be used to cover any part of the contribution made by the Federal Government under this Act; (6) any funds appropriated under this authorization shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army and made available to the State of Indiana over the period of construction in proportion to the proposed annual expenditures of the State for construction of the outer harbor; and (7) at least sixty days prior to the date on which the Secretary of the Army makes available to the State of Indiana the initial installment of the monetary contribution authorized by this Act, he shall submit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives a letter report setting forth the basis for his determination under clause (1) above. Unless construction of the harbor is initiated within five years from the date of the enactment of this Act, the authority for the monetary contribution contained in this paragraph shall expire. Neither this paragraph nor the construction authorized by this paragraph shall adversely affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana dunes as a national lakeshore.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an etimated cost of $1,254,000;

Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas: House Document Numbered 257, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $470,000;

Trinity River and tributaries, Texas: House Document Numbered 276, Eighty-ninth Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and there is hereby authorized $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000. The works for wavewash protection within the limits of the modified San Joaquin River navigation project shall be repaired or restored by the United States as determined to be necessary by the Secretary of the Army over the life of the project.

Crescent City Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 264, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,980,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests on such project after August 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

Beach erosion

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Duval County, Florida: House Document Numbered 273, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,266,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,000;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

SEC. 302. Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of waterhyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasion watermilfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

SEC. 303. The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 304. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Popponesset Bay, Massachusetts.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

Lake Dauterive and Chareton Floodgate, Louisiana.

Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

Manchester Harbor, Washington.

Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.

Calumet River, Illinois.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, from about mile 29 West of Harvey Lock to U.S. Highway No. 90 in vicinity of Boutte, Louisiana.

Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Withlacoochee River, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the project, with particular reference to provision for a side channel or connecting channel improvement through Cross Bayou to Old Tampa Bay, in the vicinity of Howard Frankland Bridge, for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

San Francisco County, California (beach erosion).

Lake Michigan Shoreline, Milwaukee County, Michigan (beach erosion).

Indian River County, Florida (beach erosion).

Marquette County, Michigan.

SEC. 305. The first proviso in the paragraph which begins "James River, Virginia:" in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874) is amended by striking out "after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date".

SEC. 306. Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1174) is amended by striking out "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$22,000".

SEC. 307. That portion of the East River, in New York County, State of New York, lying between the south line of East Seventeenth Street, extended eastwardly, the United States pierhead line as it existed on July 1, 1965, and the south line of East Thirtieth Street, extended eastwardly, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

SEC. 308. The old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Michigan, lying between the Monroe Harbor range front light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, is declared to be not a navigable stream of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given for the filling in of the old channel by the riparian owners on such channel.

SEC. 309. Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 303) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (1) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of July 3, 1958, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States."

SEC. 310. (a) (1) Subsection (a) of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended by striking out "$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

(2) Subsection (b) of such section 107 is amended by striking out "$200,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(b) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended (1) by striking out "$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000", and (2) by striking out "$400,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any project under contract for construction on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 311. The project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is modified in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost (1) such protection for the Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway bridge over the Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet, (2) such temporary protection for the center pier and the south abutment of the New York, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad bridge (Nickel Plate) as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south bridge draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet prior to its replacement, and (3) such modification of the channel limits as is necessary to insure full use of each such draw.

SEC. 312. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including, but not limited to, the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. Such model and center may be utilized, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. The study authorized by this section shall be given priority.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $8,500,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 313. (a) The Act approved December 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 846), authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges, including approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Illinois, is hereby revived and reenacted. This section (including the amendments made by this section) shall be null and void insofar as it authorizes the construction of a bridge or bridges unless actual construction thereof be commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of the enactment of this section.

(b) Section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge, or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connections with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 per centum per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this Act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed twenty-five years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges, acquired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for the use of said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not exceeding 105 and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. Subject to the provisions of any prior contracts or obligations the commission may disburse any available bridge revenues or other funds or borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges under this Act and acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, provided that all notes evidencing the funds so borrowed, if not previously paid from such bridge revenues, shall be repaid from the proceeds of the bonds of the commission when issued for account of such new bridge or bridges. In the event the commission issues notes as hereinbefore in this section provided and said notes have not been otherwise paid and a new bridge or bridges are not built, said notes shall be paid from revenues derived from the operation of any other bridge or bridges owned by the commission, subject to the obligation of payment of all outstanding indebtedness for which said revenues have been theretofore pledged. The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds, and to pay any other indebtedness of the commission, at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption, and may include, as a part of an issue of bonds to provide for the cost of a bridge to be constructed under this Act, sufficient additional bonds bearing interest at a rate or rates not exceeding 6 per centum per annum to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and en-

forcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

"(b) Such bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for at least two consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for twelve months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises and riparian rights relating to the bridge, as well as the cost of abandonment or dismantlement of any existing bridge to be replaced thereby. If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter provided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commisison may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery."

(c) Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act of December 21, 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "the bonds and interest," and inserting in lieu thereof: "the bonds, the notes issued under section 5 of this Act, and the interest,".

(d) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved.

SEC. 314. The Act entitled "An Act creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois", approved July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669), as amended by the Act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59), is amended by inserting immediately after section 14 the following new section:

"SEC. 15. The Commission and its successors and assigns are authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois, subject to the provisions of this Act; except that the authority granted by this section shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of such bridge is commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of enactment of this section."

SEC. 315. The Secretary of the Army shall transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and related water resources development. The Secretary shall also submit a report explaining the proposed legislation, and making specific reference to each change in or omission of any provision of existing law.

SEC. 316. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall make a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, the Federal Government reimbursing States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public entities, for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and other water resources development purposes, to the extent that such expenditures are incurred after the initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for such authorized projects. The Secretary shall report to Congress, not later than January 31, 1967, the results of such study together with his recommendations in connection therewith.

SEC. 317. Title III of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair) appointed Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MOSS, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. FONG conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10871) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$1,170,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$878,000,000".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment would reduce the amount to be appropriated for military assistance by 25 percent. It would reduce the appropriation from $1,170 million to $878 million. The amendment would leave to the discretion of the President the way in which he would apply the reduced amount.

I would be willing to apply to economic assistance the amount saved by a reduction of military assistance. That would mean that approximately $292 million additional would be available for economic assistance. I say to the administrators that $292 million for economic assistance would be worth billions in good will and understanding.

I hope that there will be a reduction in the wasteful, inefficient military aid program. Again, I merely cite and stand on the authority of the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States which, over the years, have been filed with the Senate, but which I fear too few Senators have read, although I bring them to the floor of the Senate each year.

I have presented other Comptroller General reports on the floor of the Senate each year and called them to the attention of the Senate. As I said in my speech last night, the reports this year measured over 24 inches high. Each report is the dimension of Time magazine so far as the size of the report is concerned. The reports contain devastating findings in regard to the inefficiency and waste and the cause of corruption in both our military and economic aid all around the world.

Most reports on military aid are marked "confidential" and "secret." We cannot make them available to the American people, who are entitled to know what is contained in the reports. However, under the rules I have been able in the last 2 years to read the titles of the reports. The titles will be found in the speeches that I made against foreign aid this year. All one has to do is to read the titles. Let me say that the contents of the reports bear out the titles. The titles indicate very clearly the great abuse that exists in connection with foreign aid.

The Comptroller General in testimony this year spoke of the serious criticism of the Comptroller General's findings in regard to the Defense Establishment in respect to the military foreign aid. All I ask is that we start to eliminate this great waste.

My proposal to reduce the military aid by 25 percent would not at all, in my judgment, weaken either the security of the United States or the security of any ally, real or potential.

Next year, when the foreign aid bill is before us, I hope that I shall be able in good conscience to recommend an increase in economic aid, not only by the dollar amounts that I am seeking to eliminate from military aid now, but also, if Congress would go along with an econmic aid program—based not on a giveaway program, based not on a soft currency program to any degree, based not on a program that involves too high a percentage of grants—based upon an economic program related to hard loans dealing with economic projects that would help raise the economic standard of living of the people, and help the beneficiaries of those projects. I would be willing to vote $2 in that kind of economic aid for every dollar of savings that we make for the American taxpayer in military aid.

In my judgment our military aid is not helping to protect freedom. It is helping to spread communism in the world. If the $292 million is spent for military assistance, in my judgment it will buy the American people the equivalent of billions of ill will. It is time now for us to start the process of trimming military assistance at every opportunity.

If we were ever to begin to reduce these military appropriations and shift them to economic development purposes, I would still insist that new economic aid be handled on a better basis than is now the case. However, in case someone

may not fully understand my amendment, my amendment bears no relationship whatever to any expenditures in South Vietnam. My amendment would leave it to the President to distribute the savings in military aid.

I well know, Mr. President, that if we continue this unconscionable war in South Vietnam, we shall have to appropriate hundreds of millions, and probably billions of dollars, in the next few years to give adequate protection by way of equipment and supplies to American boys who have been sent over there to fight, and many of them to die, in this undeclared war.

A few weeks ago in the debate on the defense appropriation budget, some Senators were raising the question, "I wonder what the senior Senator from Oregon is going to do now. It will be interesting, will it not, to see whether the senior Senator from Oregon will vote for this military appropriation bill." I answered those Senators who thought they were raising an embarrassing argument. I said that I would continue to do everything I could to try to get my country to change its ill-advised course of illegal warmaking in southeast Asia. However, as long as we are sending boys into Asia to die for a cause that I think we never should have started in the first place, I intend to vote for whatever appropriations are necessary to give them the maximum amount of protection. I intend to continue working as hard as I can, and later today I shall have some comments on a law memorandum, prepared by a group of American lawyers, which soundly criticizes—and sets forth the legal answers in support of its criticism—America's position in southeast Asia from the standpoint of our international law obligations.

Mr. President, I oppose the war in southeast Asia in the absence of a declaration of war until the President of the United States decides to get back inside the Constitution of the United States and decides that he has an obligation to live up to the obligations of the Constitution. Woodrow Wilson taught that lesson on the night of April 17, 1917, when he came before a joint session of the Congress and told Congress that he was without constitutional authority as a President of the United States to conduct a war in the absence of a declaration of war. Franklin Roosevelt taught the present President of the United States—if he would learn the lesson—when he came before a joint session of the Congress after Pearl Harbor and made it perfectly clear that, under the Constitution, the President of the United States is obligated to recommend a declaration of war before sending American boys to die in a war.

That has been my position as I have battled away on the floor of the Senate for more than 4 years for the substitution of a rule of law for the jungle law of the claw that my Government is applying in an undeclared war in southeast Asia.

Let me make it very clear that my amendment would not in any way affect the expenditure of funds in southeast Asia in the protection and defense of American boys. However, it would say to the President, "Mr. President, we think the military aid program contained in this bill is excessive, and we vote to reduce it by 25 percent; but we leave it up to you to make the decisions as to where the savings in military aid shall be made."

The interests of the United States demand that we stop arming the world against itself, that we start helping people to better their lives, and, finally, that we provide the help not on a dole basis, but on the basis of giving recipients a chance to be proud of their own effort toward self-help.

It was necessary for the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to leave the floor of the Senate momentarily because of official business elsewhere. If he were present, he would verify what I now say. I see the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], both of them members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, present on the floor.

The objectives of the amendment I am offering this afternoon were discussed at great length time and time again in the Committee on Foreign Relations during this session. For example, on April 1, 1965, the Committee on Foreign Relations, while considering a markup on the foreign aid bill, voted by a vote of 11 to 3 to cut the military aid section of the bill by $115 million.

The Pentagon went to work. We received calls from their top lobbyists, seeking to restore the $115 million.

An interesting discussion ensued. At a later meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, a motion to reconsider was made. It was perfectly proper to make it. After a long discussion, the $115 million was restored, by a vote of 10 to 8. By a vote of 10 to 8, but with a considerable number of proxies used in getting the vote of 10 to restore it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I am highly pleased that the Senator from Oregon has brought this matter up once again. He is quite right when he observes that the reversal of the committee's initial action, in this particular case, was brought about by the use of proxies from Senators who did not have the full benefit of the discussion that had preceded the first action taken by the committee.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon will remember that when the authorization bill came to the Senate, I attempted to amend the bill on the floor, as we had initially amended it in the committee, and that effort failed on a vote of 43 to 38, but only after a determined effort was made by the State Department and the Pentagon against the amendment.

The argument that was then made by those who favored the amendment had to do with the very matter that the senior Senator from Oregon has stressed on the floor this afternoon, namely, that to enlarge the military assistance program, as was proposed, could only mean that greater quantities of armaments would be given to countries which would not use the weapons as a shield against potential Communist aggression, but rather against one another. We have seen this happen in the recent war between India and Pakistan.

In the new issue of Newsweek magazine, we read of the first repercussions of our policy of arming India and Pakistan. It is apparent that the harvest will be bitter.

Newsweek quotes an Indian officer in the field, fresh from battle, saying:

> Everything we have captured is made in the U.S.A.—first-aid kits, sleeping bags, parachutes, weapons, bullets, and tanks.

Before we are finished, we shall find both India and Pakistan pointing to the United States as the scapegoat. I commend the Senator from Oregon for the effort he is making to cut back a program which, in the estimate of the senior Senator from Idaho, has done us damage in many parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. He knows that some of us on the committee have attempted to hold the line, to cut the program back, and to impose a reasonable ceiling on it; and it has always been a very frustrating fight, but a fight that must be made. If ever there was dramatic proof of the soundness of that fight, it was laid out upon the battlefields of Kashmir.

So I commend the Senator. I believe he has reviewed very well the situation in the Foreign Relations Committee. I thank him for his efforts in vindicating the position we took then and the position that we take again in the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho for the position he has taken in support of this view. The RECORD should show that the senior Senator from Idaho, as much as any other Senator on the Foreign Relations Committee, has been out in front of the effort to cut military aid. Time and time again, the Senator from Idaho has offered amendments in the committee seeking to cut the military aid program. In debates on the Senate floor, when the foreign aid bill has been before us over the past several years, the senior Senator from Idaho has been among those offering amendments to cut the military aid part of the bill. He is very kind to commend me for my efforts. The Senator from Idaho has been one of my leaders on this matter, as we have joined forces in the Foreign Relations Committee, trying to bring what we considered to be reason to bear with regard to the military aid program.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall support the pending amendment, as I have suported the other amendments of the Senator from Oregon this afternoon. He is dead right in his effort to cut military aid to Latin America, India, Pakistan, Greece, Turkey, and southeast Asia, for the reasons so eloquently stated by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Idaho.

However, I wish the RECORD to show that I do not go along with the Senator in his efforts to cut economic aid. I be-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Sept. 27, 1965
For actions of Sept. 24, 1965
89th-1st; No. 177

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....5,12
Air pollution.....6,16
Animal research.....18
Appropriations.....7,24
CCC.....9,17
Continuing appropriations.....7
Credit.....19
Electrification.....13
Farm program.....9,15
Flood control.....8,13
HemisFair.....4
Highways.....26
Information.....22
Labeling.....20
Labor standards.....21
Legislative program.....11
Loans.....1,14
Marketing orders.....23
Monopolies.....20
Personnel.....27
Poverty.....2
Public Law 480.....17
Research.....16,18
Rivers and harbors.....8
Stockpile.....3
Sugar.....10
Trade fair.....4
Water loans.....1,14
Water pollution.....6,25
Wheat.....9

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate concurred in House amendments to Aiken-Poage water-loans bill. Senate agreed to conference report on poverty bill.

SENATE

1. WATER; LOANS. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 1766, the Aiken-Poage water-loans bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. The bill authorizes the Department to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste-disposal systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with construction of such community facilities. It also increases the authorization for insured real estate loans from $200,000,000 to $450,000,000. pp. 24223-4

2. POVERTY. By a 46-22 vote, agreed to the conference report on H. R. 8283, to make various amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 24194-6, 24198-216, 24220-7

3. STOCKPILE. Passed without amendment H. R. 10516, to authorize disposal of vegetable tannin extracts from the national stockpile; and as reported H. R. 6852, to authorize disposal of abaca from the stockpile. pp. 24233-4

4. HEMISFAIR. H. R. 9247, to provide for participation in the HemisFair of 1968, was made the unfinished business. pp. 24235-6

5. ADJOURNED until Tues., Sept. 28. p. 24252

HOUSE

6. AIR POLLUTION. Passed with amendments S. 306, to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles, and to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory. pp. 24144-67

Rep. Scheuer stated that there is an increasing need to keep informed of the major developments occurring daily in the field of air and water pollution. pp. 24176-77

7. CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to make in order next week the consideration of a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1966. pp. 24167-68

8. RIVERS-HARBORS; FLOOD CONTROL. Conferees were appointed on the rivers-and harbors and flood-control bill, S. 2300. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 24169

9. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Andrews, N. Dak., stated that continuing rain poses a great loss in N. Dak.'s spring wheat crop and urged USDA to "hold back marketing of CCC wheat in order to maintain the better cash market position that will in a small way compensate...for the fewer bushels they will harvest." pp. 24170-1

The "Daily Digest" states that "Conferees continued in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H. R. 9811," the farm bill, "and will meet again tomorrow." p. D963

10. SUGAR. Rep. Findley stated that "the cost of the Sugar Act proposal...is staggering," but an aspect "far more distressing than the cost to consumers is the influence of lobbyists," and inserted from the Congressional Quarterly brief sketches of the foreign sugar lobbyists. pp. 24174-75

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that next week's program will include the federal pay bill, the highway beautification bill, and the sugar bill. p. 24169

12. ADJOURNED until Mon., Sept. 27. p. 24192

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. ELECTRIFICATION; FLOOD CONTROL. Speech in the House by Rep. Dent during debate on the public works bill in which he suggested a careful examination of the proposed power development on the St. John River. pp. A5411-2

14. LOANS. Speeches in the House by Reps. Cooley, Latta, Cramer and Dingell, during debate on the FHA water-loans bill. pp. A5422, A5423, A5429

15. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Morrison commending Secretary Freeman as "one of our greatest agriculture leaders in all of our history" and inserting the Secretary's La. speech, "The Coming Decade In Agriculture." pp. A5423-5

Carolina as provided by section 541(a) of title 28 of the United States Code. Until the United States marshal for the District of South Carolina has been appointed as herein authorized and has qualified, the United States marshal for the Eastern District of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United States marshal and to perform the duties of such office in the Charleston, Columbia, Orangeburg, Florence, and Aiken divisions of the District of South Carolina, and the United States marshal for the Western District of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United States marshal and to perform the duties of such office in the Greenville, Rock Hill, Greenwood, Spartanburg, and Anderson divisions of the District of South Carolina. In the event a vacancy, other than a vacancy resulting from expiration of term, arises in either of such offices prior to the appointment as herein authorized and qualification of a United States marshal for the District of South Carolina the incumbent of the other such office shall also perform the duties of the office in which the vacancy occurs until such appointment and qualification.

SEC. 5. All deputy clerks, clerical assistants, and other employees of the clerks, all court reporters, all probation officers and their clerical assistants, all referees in bankruptcy and their clerical assistants, all United States commissioners and all other presently serving officers and employees of the United States District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina shall henceforth be officers or employees, as the case may be, of the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina and shall hold their offices or employment under and perform their duties for that court. All presently serving assistant United States attorneys and clerical assistants of the United States attorneys and all presently serving deputy marshals and clerical assistants of the United States marshals appointed for the Eastern or Western District of South Carolina shall henceforth hold their offices or employment for the District of South Carolina.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 15, delete the period and insert: "and prosecutions for offenses committed within the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina prior to the effective date of this Act shall be commenced and proceeded with the same as if such consolidation had not occurred. For the purpose of the trial of such offenses, the District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina are continued in existence and the judges of the District Court for the District of South Carolina shall sit as judges in such courts according to assignment made by the chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina or the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit."

Page 8, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall become effective the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION, ETC., OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FALLON, BLATNIK, JONES of Alabama, EDMONDSON, WRIGHT, CRAMER, BALDWIN, and HARSHA.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 27

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, we have finished the program for this week, and it will be our purpose to ask to go over to Monday after the announcement of the program for next week, which is as follows:

House Resolution 615, providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4644) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3142: Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate.

H.R. 10281: Government Employees Salary Comparability Act. An open rule and 4 hours of debate.

S. 2084: Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

H.R. 11135: Sugar Act Amendments of 1965.

We do not yet have rules on either of these bills, but rules are expected next week.

House Joint Resolution 642: Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. An open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 6519: Amending the act of May 17, 1954, as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

Of course, this is made subject to the usual announcement that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it the intention of the leadership to bring the bills up in this order?

Mr. ALBERT. The order is subject to change, of course, but we will start with the home rule bill. A lot depends upon how long the disposition of that bill requires. Also, we do not yet have rules on two bills. However, subject to that, I think that the House can pretty well depend on this announcement, and we will keep the Members of the House advised of any changes as soon as they occur.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with all respect and humility, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma whether he can shed any light upon the business of sine die adjournment.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the gentleman pays me a compliment, because his question assumes that I am a seer as well as a Member of Congress. The best I can say to the gentleman is that we have pretty well completed the program of the House of Representatives, and I should think with good luck we should be able to complete it in a very few weeks.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 27

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LET US GO HOME

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, this has indeed been an historic session of Congress but now it is time to go home. We have established a good reputation, a progressive Congress, and to delay adjournment will only result in taking the glitter from that reputation. Why we must stay is not clear. We have handled the President's program and if I do say so we have done right well by him. We have displayed an awareness of the need to find solutions to problems and again I would say that we have done quite well in solving them. But now I am weary, I find that my colleagues are weary, the Congress is weary and before the country grows weary of our activity, I think it might be wise for us to take a break.

FULL HEARING CANNOT BE TERMED "STALLING"

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, this morning's issue of the American Banker carries a highly distorted editorial entitled "Ritual of Stalling." The pretext of this 12-paragraph gossip statement is that the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, is conducting a stall campaign against S. 1698, a bill to clarify the bank merger situation.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support S. 1698, and I wholeheartedly support my chairman. S. 1698 directly affects a bank in my district; and, because of this, I feel that I am closer to the legislation than any member of either the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, which is conducting hearings on the bill, or the full Banking and Currency Committee.

I want to say categorically that I am fully satisfied Chairman PATMAN is not stalling on the bill, but is conducting full and adequate hearings on a piece of legislation that, contrary to what the American Banker erroneously reports, has not been subject to one word of testimony at the committee level on the Senate side. The American Banker both in its editorial and news columns is probably best noted for its distortion of accuracies. I do not expect this newspaper to ascertain the facts before it makes up its mind. However, it might be nice if it bothered to learn the facts after it has made up its mind.

A copy of the editorial follows:

RITUAL OF STALLING

The chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee has his own reasons for opposing passage of the bank merger bill, and he has his own techniques for stalling it. And while the substantial majority of the banking and industry which supports this proposed legislation may rankle under the delays, there is a realization that this is the way the game is played, and some resignation to it as a kind of ritual performance.

And it seems that Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, may well make his stalling tactics work during the present session of Congress.

If this happens, however, it does not mean that the merger bill will be dead. On the contrary, there appears to be building a sentiment in the House that the banking industry has been hung up on Mr. PATMAN's obstructionism long enough, and that there is sufficient merit in the bill, which is widely recognized as primarily a reaffirmation of the intent of Congress as expressed in the Bank Merger Act of 1960, for it to be enacted. So no matter what Mr. PATMAN does in the current session, there is some basis for hope that some useful legislation on bank mergers will be forthcoming when Congress reconvenes.

Some resentment also has been building against Mr. PATMAN for the stalling tactics he has been using this summer, by dragging out hearings on a piece of legislation which already has been thoroughly discussed in Senate hearings before its passage by that body.

Indeed, there is a strong feeling that many of the witnesses have been called primarily for the time that they would kill, rather than for the freshness or strength of their views.

Now Mr. PATMAN tends to confirm that feeling, at this point, late in the session, after the hearings have been squeezed dry of new ideas, when he makes a statement that in his view it would be a grave mistake and disservice to the public if we do not give this bill at least the same amount of consideration that was given the Bank Merger Act of 1960."

That bill took 5 years to get through the Congress; but Mr. PATMAN says that he does not really mean to take that long this time. He thinks that the 48 days of hearings held on the 1960 legislation suggests a suitable time span for the hearings over which he is now presiding. Therefore, with 21 days already spent in hearings, Mr. PATMAN's judgment as to an appropriate investment in time would put the current hearings well into November, past the latest date yet suggested for the adjournment of this session of Congress.

Whether he can keep the hearings going until November, given the restiveness of a majority of the members of both his committee and the subcommittee which is conducting the hearings under his chairmanship, is a matter for some speculation.

Even if he does, however, this same restiveness among the committee members is likely to result in action during the next session of Congress. There is a kind of saturation point for stalling, even by a powerful committee chairman, and so a successful stall this fall does not necessarily mean permanent defeat for the bill.

In passing, it should be noted that while stalling tactics may be acceptable as part of the peculiar ritual of legislation, bad manners are a different matter entirely.

This week Mr. PATMAN took advantage of his position as chairman of the subcommittee to try to overwhelm the chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with a 13,000-word indictment of the performance of his agency. FDIC Chairman K. A. Randall had to sit, exposed and silent in the witness chair, for nearly one and a half hours while Mr. PATMAN droned through his charges. When he was given a chance to reply, Mr. Randall simply stated that he denied the charges, and would submit a statement for the record.

If Mr. PATMAN were serious about his charges against the FDIC, he might do better by conducting hearings to investigate the agency. The relevance of these charges to the bill under discussion is not apparent. What is apparent is Mr. PATMAN's determination to stall, and the shabby way he went about it in this instance.

RELIEF FOR THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation in this session of Congress in behalf of the trucking industry, since the railroads have lost interest in their own industry, and have interest in other modes of transportation. It appears the railroads expect the Government to subsidize the entire cost of their operation.

I sympathize with the people employed by the railroads, but they know they have definitely been let down by management which has been complacent in the last few years.

I read a very interesting editorial concerning the railroads which was heard on radio station WGR in our great city of Buffalo, N.Y. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

Railroads, once the most important form of transportation, now find cars, planes and trucks, pretty rough competition. Government, rightly or wrongly, has bent over backwards in every effort to help the railroads.

Thinking that the Federal Government is so thoroughly conditioned to favor the railroads on each decision, a trucker is enjoying a big laugh at the expense of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The trucker, Leroy Hilt of Nebraska, firmly believed that the ICC would automatically rule for the railroads, and against truckers, every time. To test his theory, he submitted a schedule of rate changes to the ICC proposing a large shipment of "yak fat" from Omaha to Chicago. Mr. Hilt said his trucking company would do the job for just 45 cents a hundred pounds—a bargain rate.

(In case you've forgotten your school days, yak are oxen from Tibet. Yak fat isn't available anywhere on this continent, nor is anyone demanding a supply. Consequently, none of our country's transportation companies ship yak fat anywhere.)

But the railroads immediately objected to the low shipping rates suggested by the Nebraskan trucker. And the ICC, after a so-called examination, backed the railroads; said the rates were "unjust and unreasonable" and declared that yak fat could not be shipped for only 45 cents a hundred pounds.

It appears that Mr. Hilt's theory has been proven correct. The ICC, conditioned in its responses, seems to favor the railroads automatically.

Which leaves us wondering about a lot of other Government decisions.

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DULSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ADVERSE HARVEST CONDITIONS IN NORTH DAKOTA

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include a table.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, North Dakota farmers are being hard hit by the most adverse harvest conditions our State has ever known. Many people estimate that 20 percent of our spring wheat crop and perhaps more of our Durum will not be harvested because of the continuing rain and wet weather. This is a potentially great economic loss to thousands of individual farm families.

Because of this unique harvest condition, the cash market of wheat has risen and will give our farmers the opportunity to make up in increased price a small share of what they are losing through this adverse weather.

While I know that Congress has turned down our pleas to increase the resale price of wheat, the need becomes even greater in this harvest time emergency. I certainly want to urge the Secretary of Agriculture to hold back marketing of CCC wheat in order to maintain the better cash market position that will in a small way compensate our farmers for the fewer bushels they will harvest and the lower quality that will result.

I am including a chart prepared for me by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association showing the present CCC loan price, the cash market closing,

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 19, 1965
For actions of Oct. 18, 1965
89th-1st; No. 194

CONTENTS

Administrative law.....6	Food.....19,22	Sugar.....12
Appropriations.....24	Hurricane relief.....1	Tariff.....4
Continuing appropriations.....24	Lumber.....13	Taxation.....20
Cropland restoration....10	Marketing orders.....14	Veterans affairs.....15
Disaster relief.....1	Monetary reform.....11	Water.....9,17
Electrification.....16	Patents.....18	Watersheds.....3
FHA loans.....1	Purchasing.....8	Wildlife.....5
Flag.....21	Reports.....7	World food study.....22
Flood control.....2	Research.....23	
	Rivers and harbors.....2	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee voted to report sugar bill. House passed hurricane relief bill. Senate passed bill to permit certain marketing orders to provide for paid advertising. Rep. Hall spoke favoring his cropland-restoration bill.

HOUSE

1. DISASTER RELIEF. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 11539, to provide assistance to Fla., La., and Miss. for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane. The bill includes a provision for cancellation or waiver of interest due on certain Farmers Home Administration loans. pp. 26219-26, 26261-2

2. RIVERS-HARBORS; FLOOD CONTROL. Received the conference report on S. 2300, the rivers-and-harbors and flood-control bill (H. Rept. 1170). pp. 26200-9

3. WATERSHEDS. Received notices of approval of certain watershed projects by the Agriculture and Public Works Committees. p. 26210
Rep. Grover commended the watershed program. pp. 26262-3

4. TARIFF. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 6568, to amend the Tariff Act

of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom. pp. 26216-9

5. WILDLIFE. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 9424, to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to administration by the Interior Department of the National Wildlife Refuge System; etc. pp. 26226-30, 26279

6. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 1758, to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies. pp. 26230-2

7. REPORTS. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 2150, to discontinue or modify certain reports required by law. The bill discontinues the requirements for reports on tort claims, Puerto Rican relief loans, and farm housing needs. pp. 26233-5, 26279

8. PURCHASING. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 1004, to make title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies. pp. 26235-7

9. WATER CONSERVATION. Rep. Vigorito inserted an article, "Water Conservation Efforts: Washington Takes a Hand." p. 26251

10. CROPLAND RESTORATION. Rep. Hall spoke in support of his bill, H. R. 7184, to provide for cropland restoration. pp. 26256-7

11. MONETARY REFORM. Rep. Curtis inserted an article by Roy L. Reierson, "Some Thoughts on International Monetary Reform." pp. 26263-7

SENATE

12. SUGAR. The "Daily Digest" states that the Finance Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) "with an amendment in the nature of a substitu bill," H. R. 11135, the sugar bill, and that "as approved by the committee, the bill would embody an amended version of S. 2567, the administration's proposal. p. D1032

13. LUMBER. Passed without amendment H. R. 10198, to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916, so as to restore the tariff filing requirements with respect to ocean shipments of hardwood lumber. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 26304

14. MARKETING ORDERS. Concurred with an amendment (to include olives and pecans) to the House amendment to S. 2092, to permit inclusion of provisions for paid advertising in marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados. pp. 26295-96

15. VETERANS' AFFAIRS. Sen. Yarborough urged passage of the cold war GI bill and inserted a supporting article. pp. 26296-98

89TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 1170

RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1965

OCTOBER 18, 1965.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JONES OF Alabama, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 2300]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

TITLE I—NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby recognizes that assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89–80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States. This plan may provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of (1) a system of major reservoirs to be located within those river basins of the Northeastern United States which drain into the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into the Atlantic Ocean north of the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into Lake Ontario, and those that drain into the

50–006 O—65——1

Saint Lawrence River, (2) major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest, and (3) major purification facilities. Such plans shall provide for appropriate financial participation by the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other local interests.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain those reservoirs, conveyance facilities, and purification facilities, which are recommended in the plan prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and which are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of the plan established in accordance with this section.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single and multiple purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10,000,000. No appropriation shall be made to construct, operate, or maintain any such project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report of such proposed project, including all relevant data and all costs.

(b) Any water resource development project authorized to be constructed by this section shall be subject to the same requirements of local cooperation as it would be if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10,000,000 or more.

SEC. 202. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law, the authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 203. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 204. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are

hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary reguirements. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

SAINT JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

The projects for flood protection on the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers at Derby and Danbury, Connecticut, are hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

NEW ENGLAND-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

LONG ISLAND SOUND AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

HUDSON RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at Yonkers, Saw Mill River, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 258, Eighty-ninth Congress. at an estimated cost of $1,924,000.

NEW YORK-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

NEUSE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

FLINT RIVER BASIN

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

SOUTH ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

PHILLIPPI CREEK BASIN, FLORIDA

The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $181,109,000, except that (1) any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, Floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928, (2) the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, (3) the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and (4) the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing, and he shall report results of such review to Congress within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. No appropriation made pursuant to the authorization contained in this paragraph shall be available for any project other than those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress.

The project for the St. Francis River, Missouri and Arkansas, within Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, is hereby modified

substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,372,000.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army in that document shall apply with respect to the Seabrook Lock feature of the project. The estimated cost is $56,235,000.

OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

RED RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

The project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, as authorized in the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1187), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway crossing Pat Mayse Reservoir to replace the present FM Highway 1499 across Sanders Creek, at an estimated cost of $310,000. Such crossing shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

GULF OF MEXICO

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,004,000.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 270, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

The project for flood protection at Little Rock, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 55, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $363,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the

Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

The project for flood protection on Crutcho Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 47, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,801,000.

The project for Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colorado, House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-fourth Congress, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in paragraph 2(a) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 1954, published in said document, local interests shall maintain the channel of Purgatoire River through the city of Trinidad. The conditions set forth in paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of said report shall be applicable to the project.

The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000, except that such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, shall be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the James River and tributaries, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 266, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,083,000.

The project for flood control on the Fishing River and tributaries, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,260,000.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $218,009,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of Linneus Reservoir on Locust Creek, St. Catherine Reservoir on East Yellow Creek, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, nor hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonsburg Reservoir on Grand River; the Secretary of the Army shall conduct a review of such reservoirs, local protection works, and hydroelectric power facilities, at an estimated cost of $75,000, and the funds authorized by this paragraph for project planning are authorized to be used for such review. The Secretary shall submit to Congress, at the earliest practical date, a new feasibility report on such projects based upon such review.

The project for flood protection on the Platte River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 262, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,889,000.

The project for flood protection on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297; Public Law 85–500) is hereby modified to waive the requirement that local interests contribute in cash 2.16 per centum of the actual construction cost of all items of work provided by the United States.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations

of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Hocking River, Ohio, in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,520,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: Provided, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: Provided further, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: And provided further, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000. Prior to initiation of construction the Secretary of the Army shall prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Roseau River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,550,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000, if local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for Ames Dam and Reservoir, Skunk River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 267, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,893,000.

The projects for flood protection at Marshalltown and Waterloo on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $17,570,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

The project on the Des Moines River for flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, House Document Numbered 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified to eliminate the requirement recommended in paragraph 10(a)(2) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 13, 1943, that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood prtection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance

with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000, except that the development of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

EEL RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,979,000.

The project for the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir with supplemental channel improvements, Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 259, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000. The estimated cost is $3,442,000.

SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,750,000.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000 except that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse local interests for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Ths projects for the Lower Grande Ronde and Catherine Creek dams and reservoirs, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, Oregon, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 280, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,440,000. The Chief of Engineers shall construct, operate, and maintain such projects.

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

The project for acquisition of additional lands for waterfowl management at John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $706,000, except that the parcels of land, in Oregon, between the Columbia River and the management area boundary within sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of Township 4 North, Range 25 East, Willamette Meridian, as shown on plate 1 of Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, estimated at 611.02 acres, shall not be part of the management area, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase such additional lands in sections 22, 27, 29, and 30, Township 5 North, Range 26 East, Willamette Meridian, outside the present indicated management area boundary on plate 1, as he determines necessary to replace the lands so excluded.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. In the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, the Federal Government shall not construct such local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, until said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that (1) it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and (2) that such reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. Such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. That the project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minnesota, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–500, 72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work necessitated by extreme high water done by such interests on such project between April 1, 1965, and February 1, 1966, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to the made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-

North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coastlines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana (water supply).

Boyer River, Iowa.

Keokuk, Iowa.

Mississippi River, north of Dubuque, Iowa.

Black Hawk Creek, Iowa.

Mount Vernon, Indiana.

Orange Lake Basin, Florida.

Mayfield Creek, Kentucky.

Hatchie River and Tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.

Spoon River, Illinois.

Grand (Neosho) River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Verdigris River, Kansas.

Verdigris River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Sanderson, Texas.

Abbeville, South Carolina.

All streams which drain directly to Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, California.

Big Mineral Creek, Texas, particularly with reference to construction of a highway bridge.

Irondequoit Creek, New York, and tributaries, including Allens Creek, New York.

Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California to determine advisability of protection work against storm and tidal waves.

SEC. 209. Notwithstanding the first proviso in section 201 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation

of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes", approved May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), the authorization in section 204 of such Act of projects for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Washington, shall expire on June 10, 1970, unless local interests shall before such date furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required local cooperation in such project will be furnished.

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of their contract numbered DA-41-443-eng-939 with Hill County, Texas, which are subject to flooding; such roads being a part of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, at an estimated cost of $130,000.

SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, subject to the provisions of this section, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the tract of land lying above elevation 454 feet mean sea level now occupied by such Society at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under a lease executed by the Secretary of the Army and dated February 10, 1958.

(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be made upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and upon such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States. In determining the fair market value of the property, the Secretary shall exclude the value of any improvements made by or at the expense of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(c) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized by this section shall be borne by the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(d) Title to the property authorized to be conveyed by this section shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 212. The authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, West Virginia, hereafter shall be known and designated as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which the authorized Justice Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

SEC. 213. In recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Washington, by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such project and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by him approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army. Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is

predicated, and such operation of the project for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890). Unless construction of the project is undertaken within three years from the date of enactment of this section, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

SEC. 214. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with the State of New York, political subdivisions thereof, and appropriate agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins within the State of New York, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate participation by the Department of the Army in carrying out such plans.

SEC. 215. The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities at reservoir areas", approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509), is hereby amended by striking out "before November 1, 1956,".

SEC. 216. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, an investigation and study of San Francisco Bay, California, including San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto, with a view toward determining the feasibility of, and extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes.

SEC. 217. (a) In the prosecution of projects for rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such projects are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of such projects within such areas.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

SEC. 218. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $3,000,000.

SEC. 219. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to accept orders from other Federal departments and agencies for work or services and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

SEC. 220. Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500,000."

SEC. 221. The Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.

SEC. 222. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

TITLE III—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 301. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

NAVIGATION

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

Rondout Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 274, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,090,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers—Removal of Drift in the Washington Metropolitan Area: House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Documents Numbered 226 and 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,569,000. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, shall include facilities to mitigate damages to presently improved areas southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of $40,000. The Chief of Engineers may include additional facilities to mitigate damages to additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge if he determines them to be necessary and justified, at an estimated additional cost of $60,000. All such facilities to mitigate damages shall be maintained by local interests.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000. In order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $570,000, except that the modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, contained in letter of April 5, 1965, from the Department of the Army to the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, shall apply with respect to recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 269, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,840,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

The project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 480) is

hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct such bank stabilization works at cut numbered 1 as may be necessary in his discretion to keep the navigation channel in its proper alignment at an estimated additional cost of $1,600,000. Local interests shall contribute to the cost of the project an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of this project that would have been required for cut numbered 1, but for this modification.

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. The Secretary of the Army may reimburse the State of Indiana for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Unless construction of the project is initiated within three years from the date of enactment of this Act, the authority to reimburse the State of Indiana contained in this paragraph shall expire. The State of Indiana shall furnish assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the harbor. No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress during the same Congress.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas: House Document Numbered 257, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $470,000;

Trinity River and tributaries, Texas: House Document Numbered 276, Eighty-ninth Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and there is hereby authorized $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project. Prior to expenditure of any funds for construction of those features designed exclusively for navigation, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress a reevaluation based upon current criteria.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000. The works for wavewash protection within the limits of the modified San Joaquin River navigation project shall be repaired or restored by the United States as determined to be necessary by the Secretary of the Army over the life of the project.

Crescent City Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 264, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,980,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests

on such project after August 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62 Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

BEACH EROSION

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Duval County, Florida: House Document Numbered 273, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,266,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,000;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

Sec. 302. Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297,300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian watermilfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from

claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not inexcess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

SEC. 303. The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 304. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Popponesset Bay, Massachusetts.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

Lake Dauterive and Chareton Floodgate, Louisiana.

Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

Manchester Harbor, Washington.

Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.

Calumet River, Illinois.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, from about mile 29 West of Harvey Lock to U.S. Highway No. 90 in vicinity of Boutte, Louisiana.

Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Withlacoochee River, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the project, with particular reference to provision for a side channel or connecting channel improvement through Cross Bayou to Old

Tampa Bay, in the vicinity of Howard Frankland Bridge, for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

San Francisco County, California (beach erosion).

Lake Michigan Shoreline, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin (beach erosion).

Indian River County, Florida (beach erosion).

Marquette County, Michigan (comprehensive).

SEC. 305. The first proviso in the paragraph which begins "James River, Virginia:" in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–874) is amended by striking out "after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date".

SEC. 306. Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1174) is amended by striking out "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$22,000".

SEC. 307. That portion of the East River, in New York County, State of New York, lying between the south line of East Seventeenth Street, extended eastwardly, the United States pierhead line as it existed on July 1, 1965, and the south line of East Thirtieth Street, extended eastwardly, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

SEC. 308. The old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Michigan, lying between the Monroe Harbor range front light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, is declared to be not a navigable stream of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given for the filling in of the old channel by the riparian owners on such channel.

SEC. 309. Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 303) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (1) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of July 3, 1958,

and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States."

SEC. 310. (a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended by striking out "$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

(2) Subsection (b) of such section 107 is amended by striking out "$200,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(b) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended (1) by striking out "$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000", and (2) by striking out "$400,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any project under contract for construction on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 311. The project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is modified in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers, at his discretion, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost (1) such protection for the Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway bridge over the Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet, (2) such temporary protection for the center pier and the south abutment of the New York, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad bridge (Nickel Plate) as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south bridge draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet prior to its replacement, and (3) such modification of the channel limits as is necessary to insure full use of each such draw.

SEC. 312. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including, but not limited to, the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. Such model and center may be utilized, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. The study authorized by this section shall be given priority.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $6,000,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 313. The Secretary of the Army shall transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and related water resources development. The Secretary

shall also submit a report explaining the proposed legislation, and making specific reference to each change in or omission of any provision of existing law.

SEC. 314. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall make a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, the Federal Government reimbursing States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public entities, for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and other water resources development purposes, to the extent that such expenditures are incurred after the initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for such authorized projects. The Secretary shall report to Congress, not later than January 31, 1967, the results of such study together with his recommendations in connection therewith.

SEC. 315. Title III of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

And the House agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
ED EDMONDSON,
JIM WRIGHT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCNAMARA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
FRANK E. MOSS,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary for minor technical, clerical, or clarifying purposes.

ST. JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorizes the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the St. John River, Maine, as it was approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the report of July 1963 of the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper St. John River hydroelectric power development at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

The House amendment directs the Secretary of the Army to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the St. John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. This survey is to include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy. This report is to be submitted to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorizes the modification and expansion of the project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents 308 and 319, 88th Congress, at a cost not to exceed $181,109,100. This authorization is limited specifically to those projects set forth in House Documents 308 and 319. The Senate bill further provides that modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Mo., floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the act of May 15, 1928, and that the pumping

plant on the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

The House amendment is the same as the Senate provision with the following exceptions: First, the authorization for the total lower Mississippi River project is increased by the estimated cost of $181,109,000 and thus this authorization is not limited solely to the projects set forth in House Documents 308 and 319. The House amendment also provides that the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and that the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Ark. and Mo., shall be the same as required by paragraph (q) under the heading "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the following exceptions: First, it limits the authorization to those projects set forth in House Documents 308 and 319, and second, it provides that the requirement of local cooperation for improvements in the St. Francis Basin shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing and requires a report of the results of such review to Congress within 1 year. The conferees expect that the Secretary will remain within the authorization in his expenditures for these projects and should there be necessity for expenditures in excess of the authorized amount, he will submit a request for additional authorization.

RED RIVER BASIN

The House amendment contains a revision of the Waurika project, Oklahoma, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to acquire lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir at an estimated cost of $418,000 whenever the Secretary of the Interior approves the establishment of this refuge.

The Senate bill does not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this provision.

GRAND RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISSOURI AND IOWA

The Senate bill authorizes the project on the Grand River and tributaries substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document 241, 89th Congress, at an estimated cost of $278,635,000.

The House amendment authorizes this project at a reduced figure of $218,900,000 and specifically provides that the Linneus River Reservoir, St. Catherine Reservoir, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, and the hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonburg Reservoir are not authorized.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that the Secretary of the Army is required to review the reservoirs, local protection works, and hydroelectric power facilities which are not authorized and to submit to Congress at the earliest practical date, a new feasibility report on these projects based on this review. The cost of this review is estimated at $75,000, and these funds are to come from those authorized for project planning for the authorized project.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorized the project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), Calif., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document 212, 89th Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000.

The House amendment is the same as the Senate bill with the exception that the House amendment provides that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to credit local interests against their required contribution for any work done by them on the project after the date of enactment of this act if he approves such work as being in accordance with the authorized project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill with the exception that in lieu of the provision relating to crediting local interests for work done contained in the House amendment the proposed conference substitute provides that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse local interests for expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the provision as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under supervision of the Chief of Engineers. The conferees on the part of the House expect that the supervision by the Chief of Engineers required in this provision shall be only that which is necessary to insure that the actual construction is in accordance with the approved plan.

MINNESOTA RIVER AT MANKATO, MINN.

The House amendment provides for the modification of the project on the Minnesota River at Mankato in North Mankato, Minn., authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1958 to permit the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to the project for any work done by them on the project after April 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the authorized project.

The Senate bill does not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill with the following modifications: The Secretary is authorized to credit local interests for any work necessitated by extreme high water which is done between April 1, 1965, and February 1, 1966, if he approves it as being in accordance with the authorized project.

MILFORD DAM AND RESERVOIR

The House amendment contains a section requiring the Secretary of the Army to pay to a lessee or permittee owning improvements situated totally or partially on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of those improvements which are rendered or will be rendered inoperative or otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kans. In no case is the owner of such improvements to receive dual compensation and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide funds necessary from moneys appropriated for Milford Dam and Reservoir project.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute contains no such provision.

LOCAL COOPERATION REQUIREMENTS

The Senate bill contains a provision which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding 50 years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects within those areas which are declared eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or any similar act. There is no dollar limitation on the amount authorized to be expended for these purposes in the Senate bill.

The House amendment contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute contains a section which provides that in the case of river and harbor, flood control, hurricane protection, and beach erosion control projects which are authorized by Congress and which are prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and which are located wholly or partly in an area eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not to exceed 50 years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of only those projects. Further, a limitation is imposed on the authorization of not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for this purpose for the present fiscal year and the next 4 succeeding fiscal years.

LORAIN HARBOR, OHIO

The House amendment modifies the project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1960 to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct a steel bulkhead at cut No. 1. Local interests are required to contribute an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of the project that would have been required for cut No. 1 but for this modification.

The Senate bill did not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that instead of authorizing the Secretary of the Army to construct a steel bulkhead at cut No. 1, he is authorized to construct such bank stabilization works at that cut as may be necessary in his discretion to keep the navigation channel in its proper alinement, at an estimated additional cost of $1,600,000. It is the intention of the conferees on the part of the House that by this modification the Secretary of the Army is given a greater latitude to construct whatever bank stabilization works (including bulkheads) he determines necessary to protect the proper alinement of the channel, which is totally a Federal responsibility.

BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IND.

The Senate bill authorizes the project for Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind., House Document 160, 88th Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000 with a proviso that any funds appropriated for construction are not to be utilized until such time as the Indiana Dunes have

been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by act of Congress.

The House amendment also authorizes this project at an estimated cost of $25,000,000, with provision for a monetary contribution toward the cost of construction of the harbor by the State of Indiana on condition that the design be agreed upon by the State of Indiana and the Secretary of the Army together with certain other conditions specifically designed to protect the interests of the United States. Further, the House amendment provides that this authorization is not adversely to affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana Dunes as a national lakeshore.

The proposed conference substitute authorizes this projects at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. It further provides that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse the State of Indiana for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as are approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Construction is required to be initiated within 3 years from the date of enactment of this act or authority to reimburse the State of Indiana expires. The State is further required to furnish satisfactory assurances to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the harbor. No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress in the same Congress. The conferees on the part of the House expect that the supervision by the Chief of Engineers required in this provision shall be only that which is necessary to insure that the actual construction is in accordance with the approved plan.

TRINITY RIVER, TEX.

The House amendment authorizes the project for the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, in House Document 276, 89th Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and further authorizes $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The Senate bill does not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the addition of a requirement that prior to expenditure of any funds for construction of those features designed exclusively for navigation the Chief of Engineers shall submit to Congress a reevaluation based upon current criteria.

CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, ILL. AND IND.

The House amendment modifies the project for Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1963 to authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost protection to two bridges over the Calumet River necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to a depth of 27 feet, together with modifications of channel limits necessary to insure full use of each draw.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that the phrase "at his discretion" has been inserted to grant the Chief of Engineers full latitude to determine the necessity for this work.

CHESAPEAKE BAY BASIN

The House amendment contains a provision authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and to construct, operate, and maintain in Maryland a hydraulic model of the Cheapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. It provides that this model and center may be utilized, subject to the terms and conditions of the Secretary, by the Federal Government and the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania in connection with research, investigations, or studies being carried on by them on any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. This provision further authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $8,500,000.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment except that the authorization has been reduced from $8,500,000 to $6,000,000.

CITY OF CLINTON BRIDGE COMMISSION

The House amendment contains a provision which would revive and reenact the act approved December 21, 1944, as amended, to extend the period of time during which a bridge or bridges may be constructed across the Mississippi River, in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., by the City of Clinton Bridge Commission, provided actual construction thereof is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act. It would also authorize the commission to use any available bridge revenues or other funds, or to borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges, and to acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto. It would further amend existing law, relative to the issuance of bonds, by removing the present limitations that refunding bonds shall mature within 25 years and shall not exceed in principal amount the principal amount of outstanding bonds replaced by such refunding bonds, and by authorizing the commission to issue refunding bonds to pay any indebtedness of the commission and to include as a part of the issue of bonds to finance the cost of a bridge additional bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes. Also, the required weekly publication of advertisement for bids for the sale of bonds would be reduced from 4 to 2 consecutive weeks. It further provides for the payment, or a sinking fund sufficient for the payment, of notes, and interest thereon, issued to pay the cost of designing, engineering, and planning any new bridge or bridges and to acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, in addition to bonds and interest, before the commission shall convey any bridge or bridges to the States of Iowa and Illinois, or any municipalities or agencies thereof, and keeps intact

the requirement of existing law that any bridge or bridges shall be operated by the commission free of tolls, after all of the outstanding indebtedness thereon has been retired, until accepted by the States of Iowa and Illinois, or any municipalities or agencies thereof.

The Senate bill does not contain such a provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agreed that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation and the conferees on the part of the House agreed to this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3788 as passed the House.

MUSCATINE BRIDGE COMMISSION

The House amendment contains a provision which would amend the act of July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669, Public Law 811, 84th Cong.), to which the act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59, Public Law 87–441) was made applicable, to extend the period of time during which a bridge may be constructed across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., by the Muscatine Bridge Commission, provided that actual construction of such bridge is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act.

The Senate bill does not contain such a provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agree that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation, and the conferees on the part of the House agreed on this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3976 as passed the House.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
ED EDMONDSON,
JIM WRIGHT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

Office of Budget

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1965 No. 194

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: Psalm 85: 8: *I will hear what God the Lord will say unto us for He will speak peace unto His people.*

Almighty God, who art always speaking unto us through Thy Holy Word, may this verse of sacred Scripture, with its message of peace and loving kindness, of comfort and assurance, be unto us a revealing light and a sustaining power during all the hours of this new day.

We rejoice that Thy Word is a lamp unto our feet and its entrance giveth light to our path.

Grant that the meditations of our hearts may daily be tempered and disciplined by the spirit of charity and sympathy, of tolerance and cooperation, as we seek to solve the difficult problems of human relationships.

May Thy Word illumine our spiritual insight and bring it into harmony with a great faith and enable us to meet each day with courage and fidelity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Journal of the preceding session.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the Journal be read in full.

The Clerk read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 14, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal of Thursday, October 14, 1965, as read, will stand approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1218. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 8646. An act for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.;

H.R. 10292. An act for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang;

H.R. 11096. An act to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.R. 11303. An act to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; and

H.R. 10369. An act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9220) entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," and concurred in House amendment to Senate amendment No. 17.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. L1 to the bill H.R. 9022, an act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2084. An act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7812) entitled "An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8310) entitled "An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 317. An act for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Louisiana, Mr. EDWIN W. EDWARDS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 371]

Abbitt	Goodell	O'Konski
Andrews, George W.	Gray	O'Neal, Ga.
	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill, Mass.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gubser	Philbin
	Gurney	Pickle
Aspinall	Hagan, Ga.	Poage
Bell	Halleck	Pool
Berry	Hanna	Powell
Blatnik	Hansen, Iowa	Purcell
Bolling	Hansen, Wash.	Quillen
Bonner	Hardy	Reifel
Brock	Harvey, Ind.	Resnick
Cahill	Hays	Reuss
Callaway	Henderson	Rogers, Tex.
Casey	Holifield	Roudebush
Celler	Horton	Schisler
Cleveland	Hosmer	Sisk
Clevenger	Hull	Smith, N.Y.
Conable	Jennings	Stephens
Conyers	Kluczynski	Stratton
Culver	Kornegay	Sweeney
Davis, Ga.	Laird	Talcott
Dickinson	Latta	Taylor
Diggs	Lindsay	Tenzer
Donohue	Long, Md.	Thomas
Dow	Love	Thompson, N.J.
Duncan, Oreg.	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Edmondson	McEwen	Toll
Edwards, Ala.	Mackay	Tunney
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Vivian
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Fino	Martin, Nebr.	Watkins
Fisher	Mills	Weltner
Flynt	Mize	Whitten
Fogarty	Monagan	Wilson, Bob
Ford, Gerald R.	Morton	Wilson, Charles H.
	Mosher	
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyatt
Fulton, Tenn.	Nelsen	Young
Fuqua	Nix	
Gathings	O'Brien	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 314 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama submitted the following conference report on the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1170)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

"SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby recognizes that assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States. This plan may provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of (1) a system of major reservoirs to be located within those river basins of the Northeastern United States which drain into the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into the Atlantic Ocean north of the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into Lake Ontario, and those that drain into the Saint Lawrence River, (2) major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest, and (3) major purification facilities. Such plans shall provide for appropriate financial participation by the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other local interests.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain those reservoirs, conveyance facilities, and purification facilities, which are recommended in the plan prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and which are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(c) Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of the plan established in accordance with this section.

"TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

"SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single and multiple purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10,000,000. No appropriation shall be made to construct, operate, or maintain any such project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. For the purpose of security consideration of such approval the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report of such proposed project, including all relevant data and all costs.

"(b) Any water resource development project authorized to be constructed by this section shall be subject to the same requirements of local cooperation as it would be if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10,000,000 or more.

"SEC. 202. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law, the authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

"SEC. 203. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"SEC. 204. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

"Saint John River Basin

"The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

"Housatonic River Basin

The projects for flood protection on the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers at Derby and Danbury, Connecticut, are hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

"New England-Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

"Long Island Sound area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-

eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

"Hudson River Basin

"The project for flood protection at Yonkers, Saw Mill River, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 258, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,924,000.

"New York-Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

"Elizabeth River Basin, New Jersey

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

"Rahway River Basin, New Jersey

"The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

"Neuse River Basin

"The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

"Middle Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

"Flint River Basin

"The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

"The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567. Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

"Central and Southern Florida Basin

"Comprehensive plan

"The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

"The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at a estimated cost of $4,986,000.

"The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

"South Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

"Phillippi Creek Basin, Florida

"The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

"Lower Mississippi River Basin

"Comprehensive plan

"The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $181,109,000, except that (1) any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, Floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928, (2) the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, (3) the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and (4) the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing, and he shall report results of such review to Congress within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. No appropriation made pursuant to the authorization contained in this paragraph shall be available for any project other than those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress.

"The project for the St. Francis River, Missouri and Arkansas, within Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,372,000.

"General Projects

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army in that document shall apply with respect to the Seabrook Lock feature of the project. The estimated cost is $56,235,000.

"Ouachita River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

"Red River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

"The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

"The project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, as authorized in the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1187), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway crossing Pat Mayse Reservoir to replace the present FM Highway 1499 across Sanders Creek, at an estimated cost of $310,000. Such crossing shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

"Gulf of Mexico

"The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

"The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

"The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,004,000.

"Rio Grande Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

"Arkansas River Basin

"Comprehensive Plan

"The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but

including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

"General Projects

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

"The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 270, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

"The project for flood protection at Little Rock, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 55, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $363,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

"The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

"The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

"The project for flood protection on Crutcho Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 47, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,801,000.

"The project for Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colorado, House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-fourth Congress, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in paragraph 2(a) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 1954, published in said document, local interests shall maintain the channel of Purgatoire River through the city of Trinidad. The conditions set forth in paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of said report shall be applicable to the project.

"The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

"(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

"(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

"(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

"(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

"(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

"Missouri River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000, except that such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, shall be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

"The project for flood protection on the James River and tributaries, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 266, Eighth-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,083,000.

"The project for flood control on the Fishing River and tributaries, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,260,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $218,009,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of Linneus Reservoir on Locust Creek, St. Catherine Reservoir on East Yellow Creek, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, nor hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonsburg Reservoir on Grand River; the Secretary of the Army shall conduct a review of such reservoirs, local protection works, and hydroelectric power facilities, at an estimated cost of $75,000, and the funds authorized by this paragraph for project planning are authorized to be used for such review. The Secretary shall submit to Congress, at the earliest practical date, a new feasibility report on such projects based upon such review.

"The project for flood protection on the Platte River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 262, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,889,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297; Public Law 85–500) is hereby modified to waive the requirement that local interests contribute in cash 2.16 per centum of the actual construction cost of all items of work provided by the United States.

"Ohio River basin

"The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

"The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

"The project for the Hocking River, Ohio, in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,520,000.

"The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

"The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

"The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided*, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further*, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further*, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-

storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

"The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

"The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of of $51,491,000. Prior to initiation of construction the Secretary of the Army shall prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

"Red River of the North Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Roseau River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,550,000.

"Upper Mississippi River Basin

"The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

"The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000, if local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

"The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

"The project for Ames Dam and Reservoir, Skunk River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 267, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,893,000.

"The projects for flood protection at Marshalltown and Waterloo on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $17,570,000.

"The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

"The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

"The project on the Des Moines River for flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, House Document Numbered 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified to eliminate the requirement recommended in paragraph 10(a)(2) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 13, 1943, that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains.

"Great Lakes Basin

"The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

"Little Colorado River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

"Gila River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000, except that the development of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

"The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

"Eel River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

"Sacramento River Basin

"The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

"The project for the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir with supplemental channel improvements, Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 259, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

"San Francisco Bay Area

"The proect for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

"The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

"Whitewater River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000. The estimated cost is $3,442,000.

"Santa Ana River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,750,000.

"San Diego River Basin

"The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000, except that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse local interests for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

"Columbia River Basin

"The projects for the Lower Grande Ronde and Catherine Creek dams and reservoirs, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, Oregon, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 280, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,440,000. The Chief of Engineers shall construct, operate, and maintain such projects.

"The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

"The project for acquisition of additional lands for water-fowl management at John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $706,000, except that the parcels of land, in Oregon, between the Columbia River and the management area boundary within sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of Township 4 North, Range 25 East, Williamette Meridian, as shown on plate 1 of Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, estimated at 611.02 acres, shall not be part of the management area, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase such additional lands in sections 22, 27, 29, and 30, Township 5 North, Range 26 East, Wil-

lamette Meridian, outside the present indicated management area boundary on plate 1, as he determines necessary to replace the lands so excluded.

"SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. In the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, the Federal Government shall not construct such local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, until said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that (1) it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and (2) that such reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

"SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. Such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

"(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

"SEC. 207. That the project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minnesota, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–500, 72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work necessitated by extreme high water done by such interests on such project between April 1, 1965, and February 1, 1966, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized.

"SEC. 208. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

"Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

"Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coastlines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

"Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana (water supply).

"Boyer River, Iowa.

"Keokuk, Iowa.

"Mississippi River, north of Dubuque, Iowa.

"Black Hawk Creek, Iowa.

"Mount Vernon, Indiana.

"Orange Lake Basin, Florida.

"Mayfield Creek, Kentucky.

"Hatchie River and Tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.

"Spoon River, Illinois.

"Grand (Neosho) River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

"Verdigris River, Kansas.

"Verdigris River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

"Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa. Oklahoma.

"Sanderson, Texas.

"Abbeville, South Carolina.

"All streams which drain directly to Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, California.

"Big Mineral Creek, Texas, particularly with reference to construction of a highway bridge.

"Irondequoit Creek, New York, and tributaries, including Allens Creek, New York.

"Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California to determine advisability of protection work against storm and tidal waves.

"SEC. 209. Nothwithstanding the first proviso in section 201 of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes', approved May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), the authorization in section 204 of such Act of projects for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Washington, shall expire on June 10, 1970, unless local interests shall before such date furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required local cooperation in such project will be furnished.

"SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of their contract numbered DA–41–443–eng–939 with Hill County, Texas, which are subject to flooding; such roads being a part of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, at an estimated cost of $130,000.

"SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, subject to the provisions of this section, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the tract of land lying above elevation 454 feet mean sea level now occupied by such Society at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under a lease executed by the Secretary of the Army and dated February 10, 1958.

"(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be made upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and upon such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States. In determining the fair market value of the property, the Secretary shall exclude the value of any improvements made by or at the expense of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

"(c) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized by this section shall be borne by the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

"(d) Title to the property authorized to be conveyed by this section shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

"SEC. 212. The authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, West Virginia, hereafter shall be known and designated as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which the authorized Justice Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

"SEC. 213. In recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Washington, by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such project and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by him approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army. Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the project for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890). Unless construction of the project is undertaken within three years from the date of enactment of this section, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

"SEC. 214. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with the State of New York,

political subdivisions thereof, and appropriate agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins within the State of New York, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate participation by the Department of the Army in carrying out such plans.

"SEC. 215. The Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities at reservoir areas', approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509), is hereby amended by striking out 'before November 1, 1956,'.

"SEC. 216. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, an investigation and study of San Francisco Bay, California, including San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto, with a view toward determining the feasibility of, and extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes.

"SEC. 217. (a) In the prosecution for projects of rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such projects are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of such projects within such areas.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

"SEC. 218. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $3,000,000.

"SEC. 219. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to accept orders from other Federal departments and agencies for work or services and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

"SEC. 220. Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking out '$1,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,500,000'.

"SEC. 221. The Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.

"SEC. 222. Title II of this Act may be cited as the 'Flood Control Act of 1965'.

"TITLE III—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"SEC. 301. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"Navigation

"Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

"Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

"Rondout Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,000;

"New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

"New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

"Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 274, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,090,000;

"Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

"Potomac and Anacostia Rivers—Removal of Drift in the Washington Metropolitan Area: House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

"Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

"Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

"Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

"Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

"Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Documents Numbered 226 and 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,569,000. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, shall include facilities to mitigate damages to presently improved areas southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of $40,000. The Chief of Engineers may include additional facilities to mitigate damages to additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge if he determines them to be necessary and justified, at an estimated additional cost of $60,000. All such facilities to mitigate damages shall be maintained by local interests.

"Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214. Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

"Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

"Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

"East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

"Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

"Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

"Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

"Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000. In order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

"Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

"Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $570,000, except that the modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, contained in letter of April 5, 1965, from the Department of the Army to the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, shall apply with respect to recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater;

"Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

"Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

"Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 269, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,840,000;

"Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

"The project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645; 74 Stat. 480) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct such bank stabilization works at cut numbered 1 as may be necessary in his discretion to keep the navigation channel in its proper alignment at an estimated additional cost of $1,600,000. Local interests shall contribute to the cost of the project an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of this project that would have been required for cut numbered 1, but for this modification.

"West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congres, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

"Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

"Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. The Secretary of the Army may reimburse the State of Indiana for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Unless construction of the project is initiated within three years from the date of enactment of this Act, the authority to reimburse the State of Indiana contained in this paragraph shall expire. The State of Indiana shall furnish assurance

satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the Harbor. No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress during the same Congress.

"Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

"Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas: House Document Numbered 257, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $470,000;

"Trinity River and tributaries, Texas: House Document Numbered 276, Eighty-ninth Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and there is hereby authorized $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project. Prior to expenditure of any funds for construction of those features designed exclusively for navigation, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress a re-evaluation based upon current criteria.

"San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000. The works for wavewash protection within the limits of the modified San Joaquin River navigation project shall be repaired or restored by the United States as determined to be necessary by the Secretary of the Army over the life of the project.

"Crescent City Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 264, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,980,000;

"Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

"Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

"Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests on such project after August 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

"Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

"Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

"Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

"Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

"Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

"Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

"Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

"Kawaihae Harbor: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

Beach erosion

"Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

"Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

"Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

"Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

"Duval County, Florida: House Document Numbered 273, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,266,000;

"Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

"Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

"Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,000.

"Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

"SEC. 302. Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

'SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of waterhyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasion watermilfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

'(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.'

"SEC. 303. The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

"SEC. 304. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

"Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

"Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

"Popponesset Bay, Massachusetts.

"Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

"Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

"Lake Dauterive and Chareton Floodgate, Louisiana.

"Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

"Manchester Harbor, Washington.

"Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.

"Calumet River, Illinois.

"Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, from about mile 29 West of Harvey Lock to U.S. Highway No. 90 in vicinity of Boutte, Louisiana.

"Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Withlacoochee River, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the project, with particular reference to provision for a side channel or connecting channel improvement through Cross Bayou to Old Tampa Bay, in the vicinity of Howard Frankland Bridge, for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

"San Francisco County, California (beach erosion).

"Lake Michigan Shoreline, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin (beach erosion).

"Indian River County, Florida (beach erosion).

"Marquette County, Michigan (comprehensive).

"SEC. 305. The first proviso in the paragraph which begins 'James River, Virginia:' in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874) is amended by striking out 'after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date'.

"SEC. 306. Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1174) is amended by striking out '$5,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$22,000'.

"SEC. 307. That portion of the East River, in New York County, State of New York, lying between the south line of East Seventeenth Street, extended eastwardly, the United States pierhead line as it existed on July 1, 1965, and the south line of East Thirtieth Street, extended eastwardly, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

"SEC. 308. The old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Michigan, lying between the Monroe Harbor range front light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, is declared to be not a navigable stream of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given for the filling in of the old channel by the riparian owners on such channel.

"SEC. 309. Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 303) is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (1) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of July 3, 1958, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States.'

"SEC. 310. (a) (1) Subsection (a) of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended by striking out '$2,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000,000'.

"(2) Subsection (b) of such section 107 is amended by striking out '$200,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$500,000'.

"(b) Section 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property', approved August 13, 1946, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended (1) by striking out '$3,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000,000', and (2) by striking out '$400,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$500,000'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any project under contract for construction on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 311. The project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is modified in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers, at his discretion, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost (1) such protection for the Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway bridge over the Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet, (2) such temporary protection for the center pier and the south abutment of the New York, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad bridge (Nickel Plate) as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south bridge draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet prior to its replacement, and (3) such modification of the channel limits as is necessary to insure full use of each such draw.

"SEC. 312. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including, but not limited to, the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. Such model and center may be utilized, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. The study authorized by this section shall be given priority.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $6,000,000 to carry out this section.

"SEC. 313. The Secretary of the Army shall transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and related water resources development. The Secretary shall also submit a report explaining the proposed legislation, and making specific reference to each change in or omission of any provision of existing law.

"SEC. 314. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall make a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, the Federal Government reimbursing States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public entities, for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and other water resources development purposes, to the extent that such expenditures are incurred after the initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for such authorized projects. The Secretary shall report to Congress, not later than January 31, 1967, the results of such study together with his recommendations in connection therewith.

"SEC. 315. Title III of this Act may be cited as the 'River and Harbor Act of 1965'.

And the House agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
ED EDMONDSON,
JIM WRIGHT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCNAMARA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
FRANK E. MOSS,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary for minor technical, clerical, or clarifying purposes.

SAINT JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorizes the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the Saint John River, Maine, as it was approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August, 1964, which is a supplement to the report of July 1963 of the International Passamaquoddy Tidal Power project and Upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

The House amendment directs the Secretary of the Army to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the Saint John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. This survey is to include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy. This report is to be submitted to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorizes the modification and expansion of the project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, 88th Congress, at a cost not to exceed $181,109,100. This authorization is limited specifically to those projects set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319. The Senate bill further provides that modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the act of May 15, 1928, and that the pumping plant on the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

The House amendment is the same as the Senate provision with the following exceptions: First, the authorization for the total lower Mississippi River project is increased by the estimated cost of $181,109,000 and thus this authorization is not limited solely to the projects set forth in House Documents 308 and 319. The House amendment also provides that the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and that the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be the same as required in paragraph (q) under the heading "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the following exceptions: First, it limits the authorization to those projects set forth in House Documents Nos. 308 and 319 and second, it provides that the requirement of local cooperation for improvements in the St. Francis Basin shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief

of Engineers, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing and requires a report of the results of such review to Congress within 1 year. The conferees expect that the Secretary will remain within the authorization in his expenditures for these projects and should there be necessity for expenditures in excess of the authorized amount, he will submit a request for additional authorization.

RED RIVER BASIN

The House amendment contains a revision of the Waurika project, Oklahoma, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to acquire lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir at an estimated cost of $418,000 whenever the Secretary of the Interior approves the establishment of this refuge.

The Senate bill does not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this provision.

GRAND RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISSOURI AND IOWA

The Senate bill authorizes the project on the Grand River and tributaries substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 241, 89th Congress, at an estimated cost of $278,635,000.

The House amendment authorizes this project at a reduced figure of $218,900,000 and specifically provides that the Linneus River Reservoir, Saint Catherine Reservoir, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, and the hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonburg Reservoir are not authorized.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that the Secretary of the Army is required to review the reservoirs, local protection works, and hydroelectric power facilities which are not authorized and to submit to Congress at the earliest practical date, a new feasibility report on these projects based on this review. The cost of this review is estimated at $75,000, and these funds are to come from those authorized for project planning for the authorized project.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorized the project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley California, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 212, 89th Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000.

The House amendment is the same as the Senate bill with the exception that the House amendment provides that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to credit local interests against their required contribution for any work done by them on the project after the date of enactment of this act if he approves such work as being in accordance with the authorized project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill with the exception that in lieu of the provision relating to crediting local interests for work done contained in the House amendment the proposed conference substitute provides that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse local interests for expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the provision as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under supervision of the Chief of Engineers. The conferees on the part of the House expect that the supervision by the Chief of Engineers required in this provision shall be only that which is necessary to insure that the actual construction is in accordance with the approved plan.

MINNESOTA RIVER AT MANKATO, MINN.

The House amendment provides for the modification of the project on the Minnesota River at Mankato in North Mankato, Minn., authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1958 to permit the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to the project for any work done by them on the project after April 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the authorized project.

The Senate bill does not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill with the following modifications: The Secretary is authorized to credit local interests for any work necessitated by extreme high water which is done between April 1, 1965, and February 1, 1966, if he approves it as being in accordance with the authorized project.

MILFORD DAM AND RESERVOIR

The House amendment contains a section requiring the Secretary of the Army to pay to a lessee or permittee owning improvements situated totally or partially on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of those improvements which are rendered or will be rendered inoperative or otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kans. In no case is the owner of such improvements to receive dual compensation and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide funds necessary from moneys appropriated for Milford Dam and Reservoir project.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute contains no such provision.

LOCAL COOPERATION REQUIREMENTS

The Senate bill contains a provision which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding 50 years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects within those areas which are declared eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or any similar act. There is no dollar limitation on the amount authorized to be expended for these purposes in the Senate bill.

The House amendment contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute contains a section which provides that in the case of river and harbor, flood control, hurricane protection, and beach erosion control projects which are authorized by Congress and which are prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and which are located wholly or partly in an area eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not to exceed 50 years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of only those projects. Further, a limitation is imposed on the authorization of not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for this purpose for the present fiscal year and the next 4 succeeding fiscal years.

LORAIN HARBOR, OHIO

The House amendment modifies the project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1960 to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct a steel bulkhead at cut No. 1. Local interests are required to contribute an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of the project that would have been required for cut No. 1 but for this modification.

The Senate bill did not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that instead of authorizing the Secretary of the Army to construct a steel bulkhead at cut No. 1, he is authorized to construct such bank stabilization works at that cut as may be necessary in his discretion to keep the navigation channel in its proper alinement, at an estimated additional cost of $1,600,000. It is the intention of the conferees on the part of the House that by this modification the Secretary of the Army is given a greater latitude to construct whatever bank stabilization works (including bulkheads) he determines necessary to protect the proper alinement of the channel, which is totally a Federal responsibility.

BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, INDIANA

The Senate bill authorizes the project for Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana, House Document No. 160, 88th Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000 with a proviso that any funds appropriated for construction are not to be utilized until such time as the Indiana Dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by act of Congress.

The House amendment also authorizes this project at an estimated cost of $25,000,000, with provision for a monetary contribution toward the cost of construction of the harbor by the State of Indiana on condition that the design be agreed upon by the State of Indiana and the Secretary of the Army together with certain other conditions specifically designed to protect the interests of the United States. Further, the House amendment provides that this authorization is not adversely to affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana Dunes as a national lakeshore.

The proposed conference substitute authorizes this project at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. It further provides that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse the State of Indiana for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as are approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Construction is required to be initiated within 3 years from the date of enactment of this act or authority to reimburse the State of Indiana expires. The State is further required to furnish satisfactory assurances to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse affects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the harbor. No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress in the same Congress. The conferees on the part of the House expect that the supervision by the Chief of Engineers required in this provision shall be only that which is necessary to ensure that the actual construction is in accordance with the approved plan.

TRINITY RIVER, TEX.

The House amendment authorizes the project for the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, in House Document No. 276, 29th Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and further authorizes $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The Senate bill does not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the addition of a requirement that prior to expenditure of any funds for construction of those features designed exclusively for navigation the Chief of Engineers shall submit to Congress a reevaluation based upon current criteria.

CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, ILLINOIS AND INDIANA

The House amendment modifies the project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1963 to authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost protection to two bridges over the Calumet River necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to a depth of 27 feet, together with modifications of channel limits necessary to insure full use of each draw.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that the phrase "at his discretion" has been inserted to grant the Chief of Engineers full latitude to determine the necessity for this work.

CHESAPEAKE BAY BASIN

The House amendment contains a provision authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and to construct, operate, and maintain in Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. It provides that this model and center may be utilized, subject to the terms and conditions of the Secretary, by the Federal Government and the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania in connection with research, investigations, or studies being carried on by them on any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. This provision further authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $8,500,000.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment except that the authorization has been reduced from $8,500,000 to $6,000,000.

CITY OF CLINTON BRIDGE COMMISSION

The House amendment contains a provision which would revive and reenact the act approved December 21, 1944, as amended, to extend the period of time during which a bridge or bridges may be constructed across the Mississippi River, in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., by the city of Clinton Bridge Commission, provided actual construction thereof is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act. It would also authorize the commission to use any available bridge revenues or other funds, or to borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges, and to acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto. It would further amend existing law, relative to the issuance of bonds, by removing the present limitations that refunding bonds shall mature within 25 years and shall not exceed in principal amount the principal amount of outstanding bonds replaced by such refunding bonds, and by authorizing the commission to issue refunding bonds to pay any indebtedness of the commission and to include as a part of the issue of bonds to finance the cost of a bridge additional bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes. Also, the required weekly publication of advertisement for bids for the sale of bonds would be reduced from 4 to 2 consecutive weeks. It further provides for the payment, or a sinking fund sufficient for the payment, of notes, and interest thereon, issued to pay the cost of designing, engineering, and planning any new bridge or bridges and to acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, in addition to bonds and interest, before the commission shall convey any bridge or bridges to the States of Iowa and Illinois, or any municipalities or agencies thereof, and keeps intact the requirement of existing law that any bridge or bridges shall be operated by the commission free of tolls, after all of the outstanding indebtedness thereon has been retired, until accepted by the States of Iowa and Illinois, or any municipalities or agencies thereof.

The Senate bill does not contain such a provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agreed that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation and the conferees on the part of the House agreed to this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3788 as passed the House.

MUSCATINE BRIDGE COMMISSION

The House amendment contains a provision which would amend the act of July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669, Public Law 811, 84th Cong.), to which the act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59, Public Law 87-441), was made applicable, to extend the period of time during which a bridge may be constructed across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., by the Muscatine Bridge Commission, provided that actual construction of such bridge is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act.

The Senate bill does not contain such a provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agree that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation, and the conferees on the part of the House agreed on this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second sesion of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3976 as passed the House.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
ED EDMONDSON,
JIM WRIGHT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10369) to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont, to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert "That the consent of Congress is given to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and to the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity as consented to by the Congress in the Act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60)."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee that approved this bill as it came to the House. I wish the gentleman would explain the impact of this amendment on the House version of the legislation.

Mr. WILLIS. I am glad to explain the amendment to the gentleman who is the author of the bill.

The amendment is a technical amendment and an unimportant amendment so far as the merits of the legislation are concerned. It simply substitutes the words "to become parties to" in place of the words "to enter into" a compact, and so on.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, obviously the amendment as explained by the gentleman from Louisiana does not affect the basic purposes of the legislation as it passed the House and, therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

(Mr. MATHIAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF 124,200,000 POUNDS OF NICKEL FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, BENNETT, ARENDS, and GUBSER.

AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF ZINC FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE OR SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, BENNETT, ARENDS, and GUBSER.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—WORK PLANS—COMMUNICATION FROM COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication which was read and which, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered the work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NUMBER, WATERSHED, AND STATE

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Back Swamp, N.C.
No. 1422, 89th Congress, Big Slough, Fla.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Blue Eye Creek, Ala.
No. 1603, 89th Congress, Chocolate, Little Chocolate, and Lynn Bayou, Tex.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Escondido Creek, Tex.
No. 1603, 89th Congress, Frogville, Okla.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Little Delaware-Mission Creeks, Kans.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Lower Bayou Teche, La.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Margaret Creek, Ohio.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Mill Creek, Ind.
No. 2534, 87th Congress, Mill Creek, Tenn.
No. 2534, 87th Congress, Mosquito of Harriston, Iowa.
No. 1633, 89th Congress, Plain Honey Creek, Wis.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Revolon, Calif.
No. 1603, 89th Congress, Swan Quarter, N.C.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Turkey Creek, Kans.
No. 1422, 89th Congress, Upper Big Nemaha, Nebr.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Williams Creek, Tex.
No. 1603, 89th Congress, Zeigler Creek, Nebr.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT, AS AMENDED — COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

STATE WATERSHED, EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NUMBER, AND COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Louisiana, Bayou Boeuf, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.
Pennsylvania, Mauch Chunk Creek, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.
Pennsylvania, Middle Creek, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.
Pennsylvania, Oil Creek, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

CONSTRUCTION OF POST OFFICE AND FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING AT DENTON, TEX.—COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House, the Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on October 13, 1965, approved a prospectus for the construction of the following building, which prospectus was transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

Texas, Denton, Post Office and Federal Office Building.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The House is not in order and we could not hear the request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asked unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Higher Education Act.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TRANSFER FIVE COUNTIES TO WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8317) to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire if this will involve an additional Federal judgeship.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This does not in any manner involve an additional judgeship or any expense whatsoever.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Colorado advise the House as to the basic necessity of this reallocation of counties of Oklahoma into judicial districts?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman, this is for the convenience of litigants and witnesses. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], I am sure, can answer any other details the gentleman may have in mind.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if he wishes to furnish additional information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have a statement which I intend to insert in the RECORD. I might say that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] and I support this legislation, as does the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], whose district also is represented.

Mr. HALL. Whose districts are involved in this legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The districts involved are those of Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. JARMAN, and mine. The bill moves five counties from Mr. JARMAN's district and my district, which are presently in Mr. EDMONDSON's district, to the Oklahoma City district. This is simply a matter of geographic convenience to accommodate all parties concerned.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman explain why the views of the Department of Justice are not printed in the report?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in response to the question of the gentleman from Missouri, the Department of Justice always yields to the Judicial Conference that makes these recommendations. I am sure the gentleman understands how the Judicial Conference is composed.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman from Missouri knows about the Judicial Conferences, yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman asked about the Justice Depart-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 20, 1965
For actions of Oct. 19, 1965
89th-1st; No. 195

CONTENTS

Animal research.....39	Flood control.....8,10,17	Rivers and harbors....8,17
Appropriations.....2,32	Food shortage.....6,14,31	Shipping.....20
Balance of payments..22,34	Forestry.....25	Soil conservation.....9
Commodity exchanges.....16	Income tax.....27	Stockpiling.....4,33
Contractors.....36	Legislative program.....17	Sugar.....1,24
Disaster relief.....9	Manpower.....29	Supplemental appropriations.....2,32
Education.....11,17,28	Meat inspection.....30	Transportation.....12
Electrification.....7	Monetary fund.....15	Veterans' affairs.....21
Employment.....26	Pay.....3,38	Water conservation....9,23
Expenditures.....4	Personnel.....3,4,35,38	Wheat agreement.....13
Farm labor.....18	Poverty.....19	World food study.....14,31
Farm program.....5	Research.....29,39	
Firefighters.....35	River basin.....37	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated sugar bill. Senate committee reported supplemental appropriation bill and pay bill. Rep. Smith, Iowa, introduced and discussed meat inspection bill. House committee reported bill to increase flood water detention capacity.

SENATE

1. SUGAR. Began debate on H. R. 11135, the sugar bill, which had been reported with amendment during adjournment on Oct. 18 (S. Rept. 909). pp. 26315, 26393-419, 26427-39

2. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 11588 (S. Rept. 912). p. 26325

It was agreed that this bill will be considered next after the sugar bill (p. 26440). Attached to this Digest is a table showing the actions of the Senate Committee.

3. FEDERAL PAY BILL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 10281, on Oct. 18 during adjournment (S. Rept. 910). p. 26315

4. EXPENDITURES; PERSONNEL; STOCKPILING. Received a report from the Byrd Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures regarding these subjects. pp. 26326-38

5. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Curtis spoke in favor of adequate farm prices, criticized the present program, and defended his record. pp. 26355-7

6. WORLD FOOD SHORTAGE. Sen. McGovern inserted and commended a speech by Rep. Stalbaum favoring farm production to alleviate the world food shortage. pp. 26361-3

7. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Hartke inserted an address by REA Administrator Clapp before the NRECA regional meetings, reviewing progress in rural electrification and outlining future financial requirements. pp. 26371-3

8. RIVERS-HARBORS AND FLOOD-CONTROL BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, S. 2300. pp. 26380-93

9. DISASTER RELIEF. Sen. Long, La., described changes made by the Senate committee in H. R. 7502, the disaster-relief bill, including a provision to permit deduction of certain assessments by soil and water conservation districts, for income-tax purposes. pp. 26439-40

HOUSE

10. FLOOD CONTROL. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H.R. 9149, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, so as to increase the maximum flood-water detention capacity from 5,000 acre-feet to 12,500 acre-feet (H. Rept. 1177). p. 26537

11. EDUCATION. Received the conference report on H.R. 9567, the proposed Higher Education Act of 1965 (H. Rept. 1178). pp. 26447-70

12. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1098, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply. p. D1039

13. WHEAT. Rep. Albert emphasized that deferment of action on the International Wheat Agreement Act extension "should not be interpreted as indicating that the House is opposed to the agreement negotiated by our representatives and ratified by the Senate early this year." p. 26441

14. FOOD COMMISSION. Rep. Langen expressed approval of legislation to create a U.S. World Food Commission "to plan the future U.S. role in the approaching world food crisis." p. 26516

15. MONETARY FUND. Received from Treasury a report on the activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. p. 26537

16. COMMODITY EXCHANGES. Received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to Agriculture Committee. p. 26537

17. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that tomorrow (Oct. 20) the House will call up the conference reports on the higher education bill and the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. pp. 26441-42

which are competitive with those offered by other nations."

I then stated the intention of this administration to provide fully competitive export financing for our industries engaged in international trade.

Thus far this year, we have made some progress in carrying out this commitment. On June 1 the Export-Import Bank set aside the limits which had previously been placed on the size of transactions and on its exposure in foreign countries which represent a higher-than-normal credit risk. Under this new policy, American businessmen can now obtain financing guarantees for exports to such countries provided they themselves assume a higher proportion of the credit risk. Exim Bank also increased the proportion of the risk it would cover in normal export transactions.

Notwithstanding these improvements, we welcome any suggestions or recommendations you may have for further improving our export financing programs.

If, as some businessmen and bankers contend, the inclusion of export financing within the foreign loan restraint program is adversely affecting exports, we would like to know about it with specific cases and examples so that appropriate remedies may be applied.

We recognize that, as opportunities increase in world markets, so will the competition for such markets.

We know we cannot ignore competition.

To remain competitive in world markets we can afford nothing less than a working partnership, in full and mutual confidence, between Government and business. I think today we enjoy that partnership.

I am most grateful to you for the time and energy you are putting into this effort and I want you to know that the President and I look forward to receiving your recommendations.

WEST VIRGINIA GLASSBLOWER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in an era of mass production, such as presently exists in the United States, experienced and talented artisans are become scarcer. West Virginia is fortunate, however, in still having such workmen attached to its glass industry, and an article in the October 3 Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register reports on a glassblower who, at 77 years of age, is still practicing his art.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register, Oct. 3, 1965]

GLASSBLOWER, 77, STILL GOING STRONG

NOTE.—There are two important steps in the manufacture of a hand-blown sherbet glass. John Schlosser, 77-year-old master of glass, at the Imperial Glass Corp., takes a glowing globule of glass, on the end of an unseen blowpipe and, as he rotates it, forms a stem with the "pull out tool" in his right hand. One of the final steps in the maufacture of the sherbet cup, or similar articles, takes a man with strong lungs. Schlosser places the somewhat cooler glass in a water-cooled iron mold, and rotates the glass, as he blows it into its final form.)

(By Monroe Worthington)

At 77, John Schlosser still gets a big kick out of working.

And despite his age, he has no plans for joining the ranks of the retired.

Schlosser is one of the foremost glassblowers in the Nation and still works frequently at the Imperial Glass Co. plant in Bellaire.

Schlosser's journey to and from work is a chore in itself.

He lives at the very top of 12th Street hill. Many a younger man would huff and puff before he makes the climb, and complain if he had to do it once a year. Schlosser climbs the hill each day he works.

There are two reasons why Schlosser does not work every day. The most important one is that there is not too much of a market for blown stemware. It is costly, and not everyone can afford it. The time is long since gone when only an emperor or his favorites was permitted to own a creation in glass. But it is still the mark of the favored family, fortunate in possessing great taste, and having more money than the bare cost of food and clothes.

Schlosser, who is extremely proud of his German descent, would probably be the first one to burst out in derision if anyone compared him to a Mountain Michelangelo. But there are certain valid comparisons, just the same.

The Italian sculptor and artist, born in 1475, was apprenticed in 1488—at the age of 12 or 13. Schlosser, born in 1888, was apprenticed at the age of 12, at the old and famed Central Glass Works, 13th and McColloch Streets, in Wheeling.

Glass is a somewhat impersonal medium, in that only one piece in a million is signed. Michelangelo signed only one of his early Pietas.

As said, Schlosser is still working, at age 77; Michelangelo worked until the day he died, at 89.

But, even though Schlosser will probably never win immortal fame, he has won a measure of distinction. When Carl Gustkey, president of Imperial Glass, conceived the idea of recreating America's first industry, the making of glass at Jamestown, as it was first done in 1607, he called on Schlosser to do this work. Another Imperial glassworker, Ernie Thompson; and one from Fostoria, John Bumgardner, made the trip to the pioneer American Colony.

Actually, Schlosser worked at the revived glassworks at Jamestown for 7 weeks in 1957; and then for the whole season, in 1958. His wife, the former Nellie Mae Greenwald of Wheeling, spent most of the second season there, but didn't like it too well.

Schlosser's specialty is in blowing hollow stemware. When you see a thin goblet, and the rich red of the wine penetrates down into the stem, that is an example of hollow stemware.

Just 1 year after Schlosser started to work at Central, the building burned. He made 62½ cents for a 9-hour day, incidentally, and worked 5½ days a week.

He was glad when the building was rebuilt. When he was 18 years old, he became a "flint," which is to say, he was considered a master craftsman, and was taken into the Flint Glass Workers Union. He was to become an official of the local No. 9, in later years.

Central stayed in business until 1939, and Schlosser stayed with it. When the company ceased operations, he went with the Fenton Art Glass Co., at Williamstown, for 6 months. But Imperial purchased Central's molds and other assets, and the artists in glass who had been with Central so long were glad to work for Imperial.

"It's a good company" he says.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate go into executive session. I would like to make that request on a unanimous-consent basis, with the proviso that a quorum call would be immediately asked for.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of South Africa;

Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia;

William H. Weathersby, of California, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Sudan;

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Ghana;

Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, of Colorado, Dr. Luther H. Foster, of Alabama, Dr. Rufus C. Harris, of Georgia, and Arnold M. Picker, of New York, to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs; and

Executive G, 89th Congress, 1st session, and Executive I, 89th Congress, 1st session, Tax Protocols with Belgium and Germany (Executive Rept. No. 7).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—NOMINATION OF DAVID G. BRESS TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. May I say, before the clerk starts to call the roll, that, instead of sending telegrams, as has been done, at least on the Democratic side, on four or five occasions, I ask all Senators who are in the city to remain here. I ask all Senators who are out of the city to return, and that all Senators who have plans made for this week cancel them, to the end that, if it is at all possible, we may be able to adjourn by the end of the week. That is a hope, not a certainty. Of course, we cannot expect Senators who are ill to

come back, but I hope all other Senators will be in attendance.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 18, 1965, pp. 26200–26207, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, conferees of the Senate and the House met in two very long sessions Thursday and Friday to consider differences in S. 2300, the rivers and harbors omnibus bill.

These differences were essentially ones of general policy rather than project versus project.

Basically, this measure is composed of projects which have the approvals of all necessary agencies, hearings by at least one House, and which stand the test of long-term policy.

The total dollar authorization for all projects, surveys, and other matters is $2 billion.

For specific projects, the total is $10 million less than the original Senate version of $1,989 million, and about $225 million more than the original House version of $1,754 million.

The Senate receeded on one major project, that of Devils Jumps. It did so in the face of adamant House opposition to action now, and the promise of hearings and consideration without prejudice of the project for next year.

The House receeded, at Senate insistence, on all changes in general policy relating to local cost sharing and reimbursing.

The House's major recession was with regard to maintaining 50 years as the base for amortization of navigation projects.

Thus, the Trinity River project's navigation feature must now meet the same test as all other navigation projects before it can be undertaken.

The flood control aspects of the Trinity, however, can be started upon the appropriation of funds.

The Senate also insisted on and obtained agreement to restoration of the Dickey-Lincoln School power project to be located in Maine. This will be the first public hydropower project in New England and will have a substantial effect in boosting that section's economic capability.

Mr. President, I submit that S. 2300 is a good bill, well thought out, and the projects carefully analyzed. I urge the Senate to adopt the conference report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it was with regret that I noted the action of the conference in deleting from the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 2300 the authorities to extend the period of authorization during which certain bridges could be constructed across the Mississippi River which would serve the people of Illinois and of Iowa. Both of these authorities were passed by the House of Representatives in separate bills this year.

The first authority extended by the House amendments was that already passed by the House earlier this year in H.R. 3788, reviving and reenacting the act approved December 21, 1944, authorizing construction of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., by the City of Clinton Bridge Commission. The second provision which has been deleted is that already passed by the House earlier this year in H.R. 3976, amending an act of July 26, 1956, extending the period of time during which a bridge may be constructed across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and Drury, Ill., by the Muscatine Bridge Commission.

The City of Clinton Bridge Commission was created in 1944, and authorized to construct, reconstruct, acquire, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill. The commission has constructed the Gateway Bridge—south bridge—and has acquired the Lyons-Fulton Bridge—north bridge—both of which are presently operated by the commission as toll bridges. The Lyons-Fulton Bridge is in a state of disrepair; and has been further devastated by fire. The City of Clinton Bridge Commission proposes to construct a new bridge to replace the present Lyons-Fulton Bridge, after which the old bridge will be removed. The commission plans to issue negotiable interest-bearing notes to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning the new bridge and to acquire land for construction of the bridge and approaches thereto, and, subsequently, to issue bonds to finance construction of the new bridge and approaches. The bonds, notes, and interest will be paid from toll revenues of both the Gateway Bridge and the proposed new bridge.

Continued authority to finance, construct, and maintain a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River, in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., is badly needed. The existing bridges, particularly in view of the antiquated nature and structural incapacity of the Lyons-Fulton Bridge, and no longer adequate to meet modern traffic demands.

The present Muscatine Bridge was originally constructed in 1890, reconstructed by the Muscatine Bridge Commission, and reopened to traffic in 1956. The bridge has a width of only 16 feet 9 inches between curbs, and the load-bearing capacity is far below that necessary to accommodate vehicles that can legally operate in both Illinois and Iowa. The commission plans to replace the present bridge by construction of a new bridge. The lack of adequate bridge facilities at this point constitutes a serious hindrance to the economic development of the surrounding communities.

I deeply regret the action of the conference because these facilities are strongly desired by the people in these areas, and there would be no additional cost to the Federal Government as a result of the enactment of the House amendments or of H.R. 3788 and H.R. 3976.

I note however, in the report of the House conference managers—House Report No. 1170—this language with respect to the provision to revive and reenact the authority of the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., and to provide for the financing of such bridge or bridges:

> The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agreed that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation and the conferees agreed that the deletion of this pro- this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3788, as passed the House, July 19.

Similarly, I note this language in the House report with respect to the provision to extend the period of time during which a bridge may be constructed across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., by the Muscatine Bridge Commission:

> The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agree that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation, and the conferees on the part of the House agreed on this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3976, as passed the House, May 17.

I understand this to be firm assurance that the action of the conferees is not to be taken as prejudicing further and full consideration of these proposals, and I understand it to be a commitment from the Senate Committee on Public Works to hold full and complete hearings on the

two House bills in the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

I wish particularly to commend the Congressmen who have so skillfully and vigorously argued for these bills. The bill for the Muscatine Bridge Commission was introduced by Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER and supported ably by Congressman SCHISLER. The bill for the City of Clinton Bridge Commission was introduced by Congressman CULVER.

These gentlemen have served their constituents well in these matters, and hopefully their efforts to extend the powers of these commissions will meet with success during the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am appreciative that the motion to reconsider has been agreed to by the Senate, in view of the fact that it was impossible for me to be present when the conference report was agreed to.

I thought that I had made arrangements for a quorum call to be held prior to action on the conference report. However, those arrangements apparently broke down somewhere and I did not have an opportunity to be present at the time of the agreement.

Mr. President, I realize that at this late hour in the session of the Senate, the conference having been already delayed for a long time, the temper of the personnel of the Senate, as well as that of the House of Representatives, will not permit enough time within which to consider the amendments which I believe the measure needs very badly.

The particular item that I shall discuss at this time at some reasonable length appears on page 53 of the bill, as reported by the House Committee on Public Works, commencing at line 9. It concerns the John Martin Reservoir project in Colorado.

Mr. President, the John Martin Dam lies 20 miles west of my own home. My interest in this project is more than cursory. In 1930 I began the practice of law in the city of Lamar. However, I had been practicing in Pueblo for a few months previous to that.

A great portion of my legal experience since 1930 has been in relation to natural resources, and particularly in relation to water, irrigation, and drainage law of the State of Colorado. At least 80 percent of my practice during that entire period related to water, water law, and drainage matters. Up to 1954 when I was elected to the Senate—a period of 25 years—I had the privilege of representing water users, water rights owners, and various people in the Arkansas Valley, and particularly in the lower part of the Arkansas Valley in which I reside.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not do wish to make a comment on the issue statement of the Senator. However, I shall not be able to be present; and I wish to make a comment on the issue that the Senator has raised.

The Senator has stated that he is referring to the John Martin Reservoir in Colorado. This is a project which was considered by the Senate Committee on Public Works and also by the House committee. This reservoir was considered in the conference.

I am not too familiar with the laws concerning the appropriation of water in the West. However, remembering my old law days, I do have some recollection of the process concerning the appropriation of water. I know that it is an entirely different problem in the West than it is in the part of the country in which I live where there is a great supply of water.

I know that it is of the greatest importance to water users—whether they be individual farmers or small communities—to be assured, if not of an adequate supply of water, at least all the water that can be made available.

The Senator from Colorado desires to preserve the rights which have already accrued to the water users. Although the John Martin Reservoir conserves and holds water, at times there is not enough water for users who live below the reservoir.

The Corps of Engineers proposes to raise the water level in that reservoir chiefly for recreational purposes, and perhaps for wildlife enhancement. I understand that the Senator from Colorado feels that the raising and holding of the water level in the John Martin Reservoir might deprive users below the reservoir of water rights which are now theirs and might deprive them of an additional supply of water which they so desperately need.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is essentially correct in that statement.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is to be commended for his recognition of this danger to water users. Almost singlehandedly, he has made the fight to protect water users of his own State and those who live below in another State. The Senator sent to the conference a very adequate and comprehensive amendment, which in my judgment would have protected those water users, or given them the maximum protection possible.

The matter was discussed in the conference. I raised the issue myself, and presented to the conference the amendment and the views of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], one of the conferees who lives in the West and is acquainted with the water laws, vigorously supported the position of the Senator from Colorado. On the other side of the table, Representative BALDWIN, of California, who also has knowledge of the problems of water users in the West, took up the fight to support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as did also Representative CRAMER, of Florida.

I too believe that the importance of the use of water to those citizens who live below the reservoir is more important than the recreational purposes which might be realized if the water level were raised. But those of us who held that view were not able to sustain the position of the Senator from Colorado although, in addition to voting for it, we made as strong a fight as possible for his position.

I understand, though, that there are certain rights which have accrued to the users who have appropriated the water; and, so far as I am concerned, I should like very much to see their rights tested in the courts. I would hope that their rights would be protected there. I am sorry that the conference did not sustain the position of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I should say, though, that his people should know that he made a great and strong fight for them, and while I am not apprised of the full context of the law relating to water rights in the West, at least from general principles I know that we cannot take away the rights of property owners without compensation. Though I can suggest no method to provide compensation to such water right holders, I feel sure that the Senator from Colorado will keep up the fight, and do everything he can to protect the water users of his own State and others who are affected along the Arkansas River.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and wish to express publicly my appreciation to those Senate conferees who did understand the problem and attempted to do something about it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator for yielding. I merely wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who correctly stated what took place in the conference. The Senate conferees, insisting on the amendment supplied by the Senator from Colorado, presented it to the conference and it went to a vote, but the vote was on the question of amending the House language; therefore, the House conferees voted on it, and the vote was 5 to 3 in opposition to adopting the

amendment. I think that should appear in the RECORD.

If the Senators will read the language of the conference report and the House language in the bill, it appears to me that there is very definite protection in the conference report for those water users with whose rights the Senator is concerned. Perhaps I do not read it as the Senator does, but that is the argument that the House conferees made, which argument the Senate conferees were not successful in refuting.

Mr. ALLOTT. I intend to discuss the matter in some detail, and show in the course of the discussion why that is not true.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Very well.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as I explained a few moments ago, there is a markup of the supplemental bill involving an appropriation of $4.2 billion now being considered. As the ranking minority member of one of the subcommittees, I point out that much of the proposed expenditure lies within the area for which our subcommittee is responsible, and that is the reason I was not able to reach the floor before this time.

However, I intend to discuss this matter at length. I hope that out of the discussion will come some understanding of the water situation in the West.

The people in the East, for the first time this summer, have begun to feel the problems involved in a shortage of water. In the West, where water shortages have always existed, we have an entirely different system of water use and water law than that which prevails in the eastern States. The Eastern States have a doctrine of law which is known as the riparian system. The Western States follow a different doctrine, which originated in the great State of Wyoming, represented by my friend [Mr. SIMPSON], and my State of Colorado. Under that system, and as provided in the State constitutions, the State owns the water, and it is made available to the people of the State upon their performing certain administrative processes, and appropriating and using the water. The first man who appropriates and uses the water has the prior right to it. That may be a peculiar philosophy to those who are accustomed to the riparian system, but nevertheless it is the system of water usage which has permitted the West to develop, and it is the one which prevails in all the Western States.

In the constitution of the State of Colorado, it is provided that priority shall be given first to the domestic user, then to the agricultural user, and then to the industrial user. The constitution does not provide for any use of water for recreational purposes. I shall discuss the history of such uses of water.

The John Martin Dam was completed in approximately 1939—not completed in the full sense, because at that time there were such demands for steel that the gates could not be put in, and they were not put in until a year or two after the conclusion of World War II.

The Arkansas River, between Salida and the Kansas line, is probably the most overappropriated river in the State of Colorado, and in fact one of the most overappropriated rivers that I know of anywhere. There are many decreed priorities, priorities decreed by a court, which must find that the water has been applied or is in the process of being applied for a beneficial use before it may grant a man what is known as a water decree.

A water decree, when granted, gives to its holder a certain date from which his rights stem. There may be a man drawing water under an 1870 decree, another drawing water under an 1890 decree, or one's decree may date from 1902, or some other date. An appropriator along the river may have one, two, or even three decrees, as some of the mutual ditch companies have.

With that situation, about 1952—and I am sorry I cannot supply the exact date, because many of my records have been destroyed, part of them in the recent flood in the State of Colorado—representing one of the irrigation companies in the Arkansas Valley, I was one of several artisans responsible for drawing together representatives of all of the ditches of the Arkansas Valley at a meeting in Las Animas, Colo. We met at the courthouse all one afternoon, discussing the subject. As I was one of the movers in the matter, the principal subject discussed was my interest in establishing a recreational pool at the John Martin Dam for the purposes of fishing, hunting, and other recreational activities.

I recognized, as does every knowledgeable person, that the John Martin Dam, on an average, is empty at least a part of the year approximately 12 out of every 15 years. No one can predict how much water the Lord will provide, but that has been the average experience. I realized, with that situation, since the dam was likely to be completely empty during at least part of 12 out of 15 years, that the operation of a recreation pool in the dam would be a very difficult matter.

Thus, that afternoon, after much conversation, many speeches and many remarks, this particular plan was finally adopted. It fell to my luck to draw up for the ditches and the appropriators of the Arkansas Valley a resolution in the form of an agreement whereby it was agreed to leave a certain number of acre-feet of water in the dam for recreational purposes.

No one purchased this water. The State did not provide it. The appropriators, the users, the owners of the water actually donated it themselves. The administration of a river, where there are various decrees broken up into various dates over the length of a river 130, 140, or 150 miles long, is a most complex undertaking. Men study it for a lifetime. The only knowledgeable lawyers I have ever known in this field are those who have studied it for many years.

Actually, administration of the river is archaic. We are basically administering the river under the same system that was in effect in 1900. There are, perhaps, ways to improve it, but they would be fantastically expensive. Therefore, we operated under the agreement which I drew up. We operated the river and the recreational pool during that year, in order that we might have some recreation in this part of the State of Colorado where it is difficult to find outdoor sports in which to participate.

I digress for a moment to say that possibly no one understands this subject better than I, because I have utilized for myself and my family every possible recreational advantage that there is in that area, from boating, to swimming, to fishing, to hunting for ducks and geese. Fortunately, it is one of the great duck and geese areas of the country, which makes it attractive to the citizens of Colorado.

Thus, after we had put this agreement into effect, we found that the administration of the river was such that it placed a burden on the ditches to the east, under the dam, to maintain the pool. In other words, water which was supposed to get down to the John Martin Dam did not get down to it. Since the ditches had agreed to maintain the pool, it was they who were east of the dam and below the dam who had to make up this water. The water which was lost by one ditch with which I was acquainted amounted to some 15,000 acre-feet or more during that year.

Fifteen thousand acre-feet for that particular ditch amounts to half an acre-foot of water for every acre of land under that ditch.

Mr. President, in a year when there may be 3 or 3½ acre-feet of water available for crops, the loss of half an acre-foot of water might not be significant. But, in a year when water is short and there is no surplus of water in the dam—which will be the case a great majority of the time—and there is available for the farmers, perhaps, only 1 or 1½ acre-feet of water, which is not sufficient to grow crops in the area, the loss of half an acre-foot is not merely a shortage; it is a calamity for the farmers involved.

I repeat this fact, that under Colorado law, as in the State of Wyoming and in most other Western States, the right to the use of water is a property right. It is just as tangible a right as the ownership of real estate, a house, or anything else. The usual custom of passing title to water is to include it in the deed. If it happens to have been converted to ownership by a mutual company, which is a nonprofit corporation specifically authorized by the State of Colorado, we usually include the ownership of water by describing the certificate representing the shares in the deed itself.

Accordingly, with this situation and this background, realizing that we had had an opportunity for a voluntary pool, and, realizing also the losses which it meant in this particular year to all of the ditches east and below the dam, we come into this last year.

One of the Representatives from the State of Colorado introduced a bill in the House which became a part of the public works bill now before the Senate. The bill which was introduced was H.R. 7162.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from this bill—which I intend

to discuss— which begins on line 9 on page 53 and goes through line 20 on page 54 of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, coming into this year, let me say in all frankness that I had told the water rights owners of the valley that, if it was humanly possible, there would be hearings in the valley before any legislation was ever passed concerning the subject.

I have been bedeviled in the press from every source. I realize that I am talking, perhaps, against the greater number of persons who wish this recreational pool. I have repeatedly said that I should like to see a recreational pool there. But I do not care if there is only one person who has a property right in water who would be damaged by a recreational pool, I will stand on the floor of the Senate, or anywhere else, and defend that property right.

There is too much of this going on in this country now. Merely because a group of people wish something, we go out and take the property of other people away from them without regard to the due process clause of the Constitution.

Therefore, analyzing the bill, it is a beautiful sounding bill, but it does not do what it is supposed to do. I am sorry that the chairman of the committee has left the Chamber because, perhaps, he would benfit from understanding what the water laws of the West and the rights of the people in the West are.

In the pending bill, one of its "cute" phrases begins on line 23:

The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas in those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River Compact and under the laws of their respective States, shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

I had an active part in drawing up the Arkansas River Compact mentioned in that phase. The dam is operated under the administration of representatives of both Colorado and Kansas.

I call particular attention to this language in subparagraph 4:

No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable to and agreed by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control—

No one can quarrel with that, because this is a flood control dam. Naturally, the flood control portion of the dam cannot be invaded, or should not be invaded, to the detriment of the flood control purposes of the act—

by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

The great weakness of this provision is that while it seems as though the man who owns water rights is caged in by protections, there are no protections at all under this provision.

The Chief of Army Engineers is responsible only for flood control, and he is not interested in this provision, except to the extent of flood control.

What is the obligation of the Colorado State Engineer? He does not represent the interests of those who own and use the water. His only responsibility under the laws of the State of Colorado is to administer the river in accordance with the decrees that I have already commented on.

Let us consider the Arkansas River Compact Administration. That administration does not represent the water owner or the water user in the Arkansas Valley. It is responsible, under the compact between Kansas and Colorado, for administering the terms of that compact, which provides for the release of water when there is water in the dam and determines at what time the dam shall be declared empty, so the administration of the river comes under the normal priority system.

So no one on the administration represents in any sense the water owners or water rights owners on the river.

The next one is the Colorado Water Conservation Board. It is endowed by statute in the State of Colorado, and it has as its primary and basic purpose the conservation and development of water for the entire State. But in no sense is it given statutory authority to represent an individual owner, nor does it represent an individual owner.

So in this bill it is stated that four persons or groups—the Chief of Engineers, the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board—shall develop operating agreements which are satisfactory to them under their particular obligations. But nowhere is the man who owns the water—whose ox will be gored, who may be left, in a dry season, without a means of bringing his crop out of the land—represented in this bill.

It has been my position from the first time that if we are to have a pool, there should be operating principles for that pool which will assure the water right owner that he will be protected and that it is futile to do anything until we have done that.

Many times I have told people who were enthusiastic about the recreation pool, not only this year, but over a period of 5 or 6 years, that if they want a pool, they should sit down with the water right owers in the valley and start working out operating principles.

Frankly this is, and will be, one of the most difficult and technical problems that I can possibly imagine in the administration of water resources.

Those who do not understand water, and those who are interested only in recreation will not concern themselves with what is the necessity before this can become a fact.

Perhaps I should make one further thing clear in this discourse. That is the particular value of water. The bottom lands of the Arkansas River are beautiful and highly productive. From that valley come some of the finest canteloupes and watermelons, as many people know. It has great areas of hay and sugarbeets, vegetables, grains. It is a beautiful land.

The land itself is probably worth $20 or $30 an acre without the water. Usually a man pays $250 or $300, or perhaps more, an acre for the land with the water.

This is one thing so many people seem not to understand. The land is only dry grazing land without the water. With the water it has developed the wealth which has maintained the cities all up and down the valley—Holly, Granada, Lamar, Las Animas, La Junta, Rocky Ford, Fowler—all those wonderful little cities along the valley. It was the water which made it possible for those cities to grow and expand.

Having said all that, I wish for a few moments to refer to the matter of hearings. When I heard it was the intention to put the provisions of the bill H.R. 7162 into the omnibus public works bill, I wrote to the chairman of the subcommittee in the other body and asked him to have hearings on the matter. I think I have discussed this matter enough to the point that the problems must be detailed and delineated and recognized. Many of those who have advocated the recreation pool have stated, falsely, that there have been hearings on this matter. It is true that various persons have met at one time and another and beat this matter over.

But the cold facts are—and let us spread it out cold on the RECORD—that there has never been a congressional hearing in the Arkansas Valley upon this matter. The only hearing on it consists of a statement by the Representative who introduced the bill; a short, innocuous, say-nothing statement by an Assistant

Secretary of the Interior; and an even worse statement by a representative of the Corps of Army Engineers, which also says less than nothing.

There has never been a hearing. The reason I wanted hearings on the Arkansas Valley was to pinpoint the difficulties and the problems so that we could start the development of a real set of operating principles, if, in fact, we wanted a recreation pool in the John Martin Dam.

Personally, I do not know where the water would come from to create a recreation pool. The director of the Colorado State Conservation Board sat in my office about 2 weeks ago and told me twice in the same conversation that he did not know where to get the water.

There will be water available. There is water available if one pays enough money, just as any kind of property is available if one wishes to pay enough money for it. If we assume that the Colorado Fish and Game Department might want to put out enough money, it could bring in money in order to do it.

What sort of problems do we face in operating principles? First, if we beef up and modernize the administration of the river enough we can be sure the water that is supposed to get down into the dam gets there. That is the first thing that should be done. This means gaging stations every few miles on the river. It means accurate accounting for all water on the river.

To date no such plan or system has ever been worked out on the Arkansas Valley, and the operators of the ditches are fighting and scrambling for water almost every day during the irrigating season. This involves totally, in one way or another, directly or indirectly, about 350,000 acres of land, and as many as 951 separate priorities.

Another element in the problem that has to be pinpointed is the following: I have a document in my hand which shows that in 1960 inflows to the reservoirs amounted to 102,980 acre-feet, and outflow was 117,717 acre-feet. The inflows were measured at Las Animas, 7 or 8 miles above the upper reaches of the reservoir, and the outflow was measured at the dam. There were 15,000 acre-feet more flowing out of the dam than was measured flowing in.

In 1961, the inflow was 136,460 acre-feet; the outflow was 147,700 acre-feet. Over 11,000 acre-feet more flowed out of the dam than was measured into it.

In 1962, the inflow was 124,300 acre-feet. The outflow was 149,500 acre-feet, so in that year over 25,000 acre-feet more water flowed out of the dam than flowed into it.

This may seem quite a paradox, Mr. President, but the facts are that the accretions in sites unmeasured, side streams and drainage areas, have increased the flow to that extent and more, because evaporation and seepage are not considered in those figures.

During years of larger inflow there would be greater storage in John Martin Dam. There are undoubtedly large amounts of water not measured in the two gages at Las Animas.

The next problem that has to be delineated by hearings—and I am still talking about hearings—is the matter of evaporation and seepage. This is one of the most difficult matters to ascertain.

One person said that we can put evaporation pans at the dam and see how much water evaporates out of a pan. Then we could tell whom to charge for the water.

But, evaporation varies from day to day. It varies from week to week and month to month. It varies from year to year.

Senators may say that this is fantastic, but during the years 1941 and 1942 I saw one rather shallow reservoir—and the recreation pool will be a shallow reservoir—lose almost a foot of water in 1 day during a period in the summer when the temperature was in excess of 100 degrees and there were high winds of 35 to 40 miles an hour.

How do we keep track of a high rate of evaporation under conditions like this as against a low evaporation during a relatively cool and wet summer? Someone has to decide how to determine and somebody has to decide the method by which this water will be charged to the recreation pool, rather than to force those who have laid out their money for their farms to make up the water that is lost by evaporation.

Another question with respect to the hearings on the evaporation matter is, Who is going to be given the power to determine what the rate of evaporation is? This, I believe, is probably one of the most difficult questions that will be involved.

I have only suggested in this discourse a few problems that arise. I shall discuss another.

If we maintain a recreation pool at John Martin Dam, it means that rather than irrigating with muddy water, as is now done most of the time, water users will always be drawing clear water out of the reservoir.

Those who are not knowledgeable about irrigation may view this as an insignificant point The fact is that muddy water is preferred by the farmers, first, because it always adds new mineral content to their soil, and, second, because it goes over farther in spreading over the land. I know of no man with experience in irrigation who will not verify this.

But when they revert to irrigation with clear water, not merely for a few months or a year, but over a period of 5 to 10 to 20 years, the result will be that there will be a serious scouring of the ditches below the dam and the laterals. This is based on a simple principle of physics. We all know that water in motion will carry a certain number of solids. If the water is stopped the solids will drop. But while this water is, we might say, soaked up or saturated with solids or minerals, it cannot pick up more from the ditch bottoms and, therefore, it does not scour the ditches.

But if we face a situation—and I believe this is something to be contemplated—where farmers are irrigating with clear water over a period of 5 to 10 years or more, there is no question in my mind that the farmers will have to start lining their ditches with concrete. When it is contemplated that some of the ditches are 65 and 75 miles long, and when we consider all the radial laterals into the farmland, it can be seen that a great amount of money is involved.

Who is going to pay for the change-over to line the ditches and laterals? This is a subject that ought to be discussed and settled by the operating principals.

But more than anything else, the farmers, the water right owners of the valley, have a right to hearings in the valley on this subject. There have really been no hearings on the bill. Hearings in the House, such as they were, were pitifully short—short of facts and short of knowledge. The hearings were not previously announced, because I certainly would have been in attendance had I had the opportunity to do so.

This subject was not even considered in the Senate, but that was not the fault of the chairman, because the bill was not pending before the Senate. There were only the inadequate, and perfunctory hearings in the House, followed by the insistence of Members of the other body that the Senate accept the bill. So the bill was crammed down our throats, as so many other bills have been crammed down our throats by the other body.

After the other body had passed the bill, I communicated with Members of the Senate. I had previously asked the chairman of the House committee to hold hearings in the Arkansas Valley. I prepared an amendment which I though would protect the water right owners in the Arkansas Valley against this incursion of their own property rights. It is a wholly reasonable amendment, because all it provides, in addition to asking that the principles be approved by the people I have previously mentioned, is that the plan shall be approved by two-thirds of the water right owners above the dam and two-thirds of the water right owners below the dam. It would be completely reasonable to say that it should be approved by every water right owner; but I thought that if the two-thirds figure were used that it might appeal to reasonable men.

Nevertheless, we sit here today with a bill that is about to become law, a bill which is an incursion upon private property rights, a bill which will deprive people, or which stands a chance to deprive them of their property over a period of years without any protection. One vital question is: What good will it do to tell a man, as the bill does, that the rights of the irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to the waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of the respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph?

What good would it do to write a clause like that into a bill, when the only recourse that is left to a man is a lawsuit? That is what has been written into the bill. Instead of protecting people who have rights that are about to be infringed upon, we have left them with the possibility and right of bringing lawsuits after they have been damaged, after they may have lost a large amount

of water during one summer through bad administration, and have thus not had sufficient water, have no crops, and are mortgaged up to the hilt at the bank. They will be left with the wonderful right to bring lawsuits, because that is all the bill provides. It provides that the water rights shall not be infringed upon, and leaves the water right owner with the right of a lawsuit—the right of a lawsuit not against the State engineer, because he cannot be sued for money; the right of a lawsuit, perhaps, against 1, 2, 10, 12, or 15 ditches; and perhaps injunctive relief against the compact administration, although I am not sure of that.

Furthermore, I am not certain that we have a constitutional piece of legislation before us. As I read the bill, it would amend the Arkansas River compact. That compact was ratified by the Legislatures of Kansas and Colorado, and was later confirmed by Congress. When it came before Congress, it was referred in the Senate, under the rules of the Senate, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That committee has had no opportunity to act upon the proposal; yet we are here modifying a compact between two States for the operation, storage, and release of water in a reservoir—a compact ratified by both State legislatures and confirmed by Congress.

I do not know how Congress, in a single legislative act, can modify a compact between the States. I thoroughly believe that this provision is unconstitutional, and that if that question ever comes before any court in the land having appropriate jurisdiction, that court will declare it to be unconstitutional.

We who live in this rather arid area realize the value of recreation. Perhaps there is a way, although it will be a tedious, hard way, to work out operating principles so as to protect irrigators. But I fear that what has been developed now is only the possibility of a multiplicity of lawsuits, not only between individual irrigators, who always have this right, but between ditch companies and the State of Colorado and the State of Kansas. So the bill might, perhaps, generate a multiplicity of lawsuits, not only after actual damage has been done to the irrigator or to a ditch company, but even before that, because of the unconstitutionality of this particular provision. I only wish that those who were so enthusiastic had not permitted their enthusiasm to run away with their sense of justice and, most of all, with their sense of fairness. I fail to see how a multiplicity of lawsuits will further the cause of a permanent pool.

It does not matter that there are, I suppose, some 900 or 950 different water rights in the Arkansas Valley. If only one man had paid $200, $250, or $300 or more an acre for his land with a property right of water attached to it and if that man were in imminent danger, I would compelled to speak with as much force and feeling as I speak today.

I am sorry that a majority of the conferees from the House of Representatives made such short shrift of this matter and gave so little consideration to it. I am completely aware that, at this late hour in the session, there is no possibility of getting the Senate to send this measure back to conference for 2, 3, or 4 days of conference. However, a great injustice has been done by this piece of legislation.

I cannot understand the thinking of people who get so far away from the American system that they can say that the people in the Arkansas Valley are not entitled to hearings in the Arkansas Valley on this matter.

We cannot bring every farmer from the valley to Washington, D.C. There is not that kind of money in the valley. However, they are entitled to hearings before Congress, in which hearings the problems and perhaps the solutions to the problems may be set down in writing on the record. It would not be a big bull session participated in by farmers and other people who have gotten together to talk generally about this matter. The facts should be put in writing so that they may be analyzed by the experts and the problems may be separated, studied, and perhaps solved. This is all that the hearings would mean. However, the hearings have never been held, and, under this legislation as it now exists, the hearings will never be held.

I regret that I have had to take the time of the Senate on what is a relatively small matter in relation to the entire scheme of our legislation. However, it is only because I feel deeply that this question must be brought to the attention of the Senate and that a record should to be made on the matter that I have taken this time for the purpose of informing the Senate about the law and the facts in this case, and particularly the members of the Committee on Public Works who may have to deal with this matter in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I proffered to the conferees, which amendment would make this legislation at least partially acceptable, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposed amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO S. 2300

On page 54, strike lines 7 through 15, and insert in lieu thereof:

"(4)(a) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be established or maintained except upon written terms and conditions, including operating principles, acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in the interest of flood control and (B) by the Colorado State engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and the appropriators of water (evidenced, in the case of mutual or corporate entities, by the adoption of resolutions by their boards of directors) representing in the aggregate two-thirds of the total decreed priorities (exclusive of storage rights) in the upper and lower Arkansas River, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes while preserving the integrity of decreed water rights for other beneficial purposes. For the purposes of this Act, the 'upper Arkansas River' shall include only the main stream of the Arkansas River between the city of Pueblo, Colorado, and the John Martin Dam and 'lower Arkansas River' shall include the main stream thereof from the John Martin Dam to the Kansas-Colorado State line.

"(b) Upon agreement as provided in subsection (a), the Representative of the United States and chairman of the Arkansas River Compact Administration shall make a report to the Congress of the agreement and the proceedings leading thereto and of any changes or modifications to the Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) made necessary by said agreement to such terms and conditions including operating principles: *Provided*, That any such changes or modifications to said compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of said States and approved by the Congress of the United States."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the position which the Senator from Colorado has taken is one which is shared by many people. There exists in the Arkansas Valley an organization known as the Arkansas Valley Ditch Association, which association is composed of the member ditches. This association has represented the individual ditches and individual rights up and down the river for many years.

I received from this association on the 23d of September a telegram which reads as follows:

Arkansas Valley Ditch Association wishes to applaud your stand on John Martin recreational pool. Operating principles to protect irrigators' water rights are absolutely necessary.

This wire is signed by Lloyd Barnhart, secretary-treasurer of the Arkansas Valley Ditch Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter written by me under date of July 28, 1965, to Mr. Felix L. Sparks, a director of the Colorado Water and Conservation Board. In this letter I set out the position that I have consistently taken since this matter was first raised.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 28, 1965.

Mr. FELIX L. SPARKS,
Director, Colorado Water Conservation Board, 215 State Services Building, Denver, Colo.

DEAR LARRY: Thank you for your letter of July 19, relative to the action taken by the Colorado Water Conservation Board on July 12, 1965, in support of my request and the action of the corps to discontinue releases from John Martin in excess of irrigation needs.

I have also had handed to me a copy of a letter from Ray Moses to you dated July 17 and a copy of the letter from Mr. Smrha, chief engineer of the Division of Water Resources, State of Kansas, and a member of the Compact Commission, dated July 14 and addressed to Lieutenant General Cassidy, Chief of Engineers.

First, let me make it very clear that I realize as well as anyone what a recreational pool could mean to the people of southeastern Colorado, and have always favored it. There are, however, certain problems in the establishment of a permanent pool, which cannot be ignored, nor passed over, without resultant long and expensive litigation, which, in the long run, would not only delay the establishment of the permanent pool, but would also endanger its eventual realization.

There is a common assumption that the dam operates on the conservation pool only for the benefit of the irrigators below the dam. This is a completely erroneous assumption because historically it can be shown that in some instances the ditches above the dam have been able to increase their diversions two- three-fold by the wise and prudent use of the conversation pool under the direction of the compact commission.

The first question that has come up since the recent floods is the question of ownership of the waters that were in the Setchfield Dam. Laying aside for a moment the nature of its decree, with which I am not personally acquainted, there is the issue proposed by some of our more enthusiastic conservationists that this water belongs to the State, i.e., the people, since it is now in the John Martin Reservoir. The second question arising out of the Setchfield Dam is the one raised in your letter as to whether this decree could be properly transferred to an inferior use under article XVI; section 6 of our Colorado constitution, and I am assuming that your letter is correct in stating that there are no irrigation rights between the Setchfield and John Martin. It seems to me that an early attempt should be made to solve these two questions.

Of historical interest, it was in 1950, I believe, with my own active, personal participation, that representatives of all the ditches on the Arkansas were brought together at the district courtroom in Las Animas to try to formulate an operating agreement for a voluntary conservation pool on the John Martin. Largely upon my own urging, many of the ditches agreed to go along and all then finally agreed to operate such a pool. The compact commission assented to treat John Martin as empty when it had reached a minimum of 8,000 acre-feet (I am not absolutely certain of the figure of 8,000 acre-feet, not having access to my file).

The various gaging stations on the river have always been somewhat inaccurate and the result has been that when there was a certain amount of water in the river at Pueblo, which would indicate that there should be a certain amount of water in the river for each of the ditches in the valley, a hole in the river invariably occurred and the river did not produce the amount of water at John Martin which would have satisfied the apportionment of the demands of ditches below the dam. Since all had agreed to contribute a certain amount of conservation water in the pool, the ditches below the dam invariably ended up short, and, as a consequence, lost many thousands of acre-feet of water during that irrigation season. This deficiency in the river above was caused, in my opinion, by (1) inaccurate gaging stations, (2) an archaic system of water administration, and (3) the inability to effect an immediate cutback by ditches between Pueblo and John Martin when the river was falling upon the orders of the division engineer in Pueblo.

Within limits, the middle paragraph on page 2 of your letter is true. However, the evaporation pans do not necessarily take into consideration the effect of high, hot winds, which cause an abnormal amount of evaporation. But, assuming that this could be corrected, the question then becomes: "Who determines the evaporation?" It must be remembered that the shorting of ditches below the dam eventually also depletes the river above the dam and reduces subsequent diversions for them.

It seems to me that the most important thing for those genuinely interested in a recreation pool is to meet with the Arkansas ditches and attempt to set up operating principles which will protect the vested right of the people who have purchased lands with water attached thereto. An agreement to a set of operating principles by the ditches themselves to me is a necessary part of the consideration of such a pool, and should be included in the legislation, just as operating principles were included in the Arkansas River Compact, as approved by Congress. This would, of course, have to have the concurrence of the compact commission, now legally charged with the operation of the conservation pool.

These are some of the questions that must be resolved and deficiencies that must be remedied in the State before any meaningful congressional action can be taken with regard to the establishment of the permanent pool.

Also, in a public meeting on this matter in Lamar with all the ditch companies on January 31, 1964, I promised those present that I would do my best to see that a public hearing was held in the area before any legislation passed the Senate. I still feel that I am obligated to this promise.

I will be very happy to have your comments on these thoughts. Since the entire Arkansas Valley is a farming area, we cannot ignore the fact there are certain rights protected under the due process clause or that every farmer has a vital interest in the Arkansas River, which is already probably the worst overappropriated river in Colorado.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator.

cc: Hon. John A. Love.
Mr. Ray Moses.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD numerous letters which I have received concerning this matter. These letters support the position I have taken with respect to the John Martin Dam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN MARTIN PERMANENT POOL

1. John Martin Dam (formerly known as the Caddoa Dam) is located in the Arkansas River in the State of Colorado, Bent County, about 20 miles west of Lamar, Colo.

2. Construction of the John Martin Dam was authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570).

3. Since May 31, 1949, the waters of the Arkansas River impounded behind the John Martin Dam are controlled and apportioned by the Arkansas River Compact (63 Stat. 145), and administered by the Arkansas River Compact Administration as established by the Compact. The Administration consists of 3 members from Colorado, 3 members from Kansas, and an ex-officio Federal member who shall act as chairman, without vote (Art. VIII).

4. As set forth in Article I, the major purposes of the Compact are to:

"A. Settle existing disputes and remove causes of future controversy between the States of Colorado and Kansas, and between citizens of one and citizens of the other State, concerning the waters of the Arkansas River and their control, conservation and utilization for irrigation and other beneficial purposes.

"B. Equitably divide the apportion between the States of Colorado and Kansas the waters of the Arkansas River and their utilization as well as the benefits arising from the construction, operation and maintenance by the United States of John Martin Reservoir Project for water conservation purposes."

And to implement the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court entered December 6, 1943, in the case of *Colorado* v. *Kansas* (320 U.S. 383) concerning the relative rights of the respective States in and to the use of waters of the Arkansas River.

5. Division of waters and operating principles are contained in article V.

6. Article III F of the compact defines the "conservation pool" as that portion of total storage lying below the "flood control storage" pool. The demarkation is set at elevation 3,851 m.s.l. in article IV C.

7. The compact was not intended to impede or prevent future beneficial development of the Arkansas River, "Provided, that the waters of the Arkansas River, as defined in article III, shall not be materially depleted in usable quantity or availability for use to the water users in Colorado and Kansas under this compact by such future development or construction."

8. H.R. 7162 (Evans of Colorado) seeks to invade the Flood Control Storage pool to the extent of 10,000 acre-feet for the purpose of establishing a permanent recreation pool. It does not establish operating principles for the permanent recreation pool, nor does it amend the Arkansas River Compact which is the controlling instrument for the conservation pool. It does attempt to offer some protection by requiring that the permanent pool be operated on "written terms and conditions" agreed to by the Corps of Engineers, the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board. However, since the conservation pool (all the water below elevation 3,851) is to be administered strictly in conformance with the operating principles set forth in the compact (article V) and these principles do not provide for the maintenance of a permanent pool, a conflict would exist between the "written terms and conditions" (amounting to a supplemental agreement without formal sanction of Congress and the original negotiating parties: i.e., State of Kansas and State of Colorado) and the provisions of the Arkansas River Compact. The compact, as a superior instrument, would be controlling.

9. H.R. 7162 contains this provision: "(2) The right of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this Act." This is only the empty expression of a pious sentiment unless measures are taken to insure that in actual practice the rights of the irrigators are preserved. Among the measures that must be taken are:

(a) the installation of accurate gaging stations with continuous recording devices;

(b) the updating of an archaic system of water administration;

(c) the developed and proven ability to effect immediate cutback of diversions when the river is falling;

(d) the establishment of a greatly improved communication system between the division engineer and head gatekeepers so that orders are carried out immediately;

(e) the development of realistic operating principles that are binding upon all parties to eliminate as far as possible the likelihood of costly and extended litigation which could frustrate the establishment of the permanent pool for many years if not indefinitely.

10. Sedimentation has already diminished the capacity of the reservoir by 38,000 acre-feet or more. The conservation pool has had to absorb 36,000 acre-feet of this, reducing its capacity from 400,000 acre-feet to 364,000 acre-feet.

Question: "Will a permanent pool increase sedimentation, thereby shortening the life of the reservoir?

"If so, how much will it increase sedimentation, and how many years will it shorten the life of the reservoir?"

11. It is indicated that 10,000 acre-feet of water will have a surface area of approximately 1,600 acres and therefore an average

depth of about 6 feet. Maximum depth would be about 20 feet, but nearly 15 feet of the 20 feet would be silty.

Question: "During low water periods (such as 1963–64) will 10,000 acre-feet be sufficient to support fish in any consequential numbers?"

An act to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River compact

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact, signed (after negotiations in which a representative of the United States, duly appointed by the President, participated, and upon which he has reported to the Congress) by the Commissioners for the States of Colorado and Kansas on December 14, 1948, at Denver, Colorado, and thereafter ratified by the legislatures of each of the States aforesaid, which said compact reads as follows:

"ARKANSAS RIVER COMPACT

"The State of Colorado and the State of Kansas, parties signatory to this Compact (hereinafter referred to as 'Colorado' and 'Kansas', respectively, or individually as a 'State', or collectively as the 'States') having resolved to conclude a compact with respect to the waters of the Arkansas River, and being moved by considerations of interstate comity, having appointed commissioners as follows: 'Henry C. Vidal, Gail L. Ireland, and Harry B. Mendenhall, for Colorado; and George S. Knapp, Edward F. Arn, and William E. Leavitt, and Roland H. Tate, for Kansas'; and the consent of the Congress of the United States to negotiate and enter into an interstate compact not later than January 1, 1950, having been granted by Public Law 34, 79th Congress, 1st Session, and pursuant thereto the President having designated Hans Kramer as the representative of the United States, the said commissioners for Colorado and Kansas, after negotiations participated in by the representative of the United States, have agreed as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"The major purposes of this Compact are to:

"A. Settle existing disputes and remove causes of future controversy between the States of Colorado and Kansas, and between citizens of one and citizens of the other State, concerning the waters of the Arkansas River and their control, conservation and utilization for irrigation and other beneficial purposes.

"B. Equitably divide and apportion between the States of Colorado and Kansas the waters of the Arkansas River and their utilization as well as the benefits arising from the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of John Martin Reservoir Project for water conservation purposes.

"ARTICLE II

"The provisions of this compact are based on (1) the physical and other conditions peculiar to the Arkansas River and its natural drainage basin, and the nature and location of irrigation and other developments and facilities in connection therewith; (2) the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court entered December 6, 1943, in the case of *Colorado* v. *Kansas* (320 U.S. 383) concerning the relative rights of the respective States in and to the use of waters of the Arkansas River; and (3) the experience derived under various interim executive agreements between the two States apportioning the waters released from the John Martin Reservoir as operated by the Corps of Engineers.

"ARTICLE III

"As used in this compact:

"A. The word 'State line' means the geographical boundary line between Colorado and Kansas.

"B. The term 'waters of the Arkansas River' means the waters originating in the natural drainage basin of the Arkansas River, including its tributaries, upstream from the State line, and excluding waters brought into the Arkansas River Basin from other river basins.

"C. The term 'State line flow' means the flow of waters of the Arkansas River as determined by gaging stations located at or near the State line. The flow as determined by such stations, whether located in Colorado or Kansas, shall be deemed to be the actual State line flow.

"D. 'John Martin Reservoir Project' is the official name of the facility formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir Project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1936, as amended, for construction, operation and maintenance by the War Department, Corps of Engineers, later designated as the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, and herein referred to as the 'Corps of Engineers.' 'John Martin Reservoir' is the water storage space created by 'John Martin Dam.'

"E. The 'flood control storage' is that portion of the total storage space in John Martin Reservoir allocated to flood control purposes.

"F. The 'conservation pool' is that portion of the total storage space in John Martin Reservoir lying below the flood control storage.

"G. The 'ditches of Colorado Water District 67' are those ditches and canals which divert water from the Arkansas River or its tributaries downstream from John Martin Dam for irrigation use in Colorado.

"H. The term 'river flow' means the sum of the flows of the Arkansas and the Purgatoire Rivers into John Martin Reservoir as determined by gaging stations appropriately located above said reservoir.

"I. The term 'the administration' means the Arkansas River Compact Administration established under Article VIII.

"ARTICLE IV

"Both States recognize that:

"A. This compact deals only with the waters of the Arkansas River as defined in Article III.

"B. This compact is not concerned with the rights, if any, of the State of New Mexico or its citizens in and to the use in New Mexico of waters of Trinchera Creek or other tributaries of the Purgatoire River, a tributary of the Arkansas River.

"C. (1) John Martin Dam will be operated by the Corps of Engineers to store and release the waters of the Arkansas River in and from John Martin Reservoir for its authorized purposes.

"(2) The bottom of the flood control storage is presently fixed by the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, at elevation 3,851 feet above mean sea level. The flood control storage will be operated for flood control purposes and to those ends will impound or regulate the streamflow volumes that are in excess of the then available storage capacity of the conservation pool. Releases from the flood control storage may be made at times and rates determined by the Corps of Engineers to be necessary or advisable without regard to ditch diversion capacities or requirements in either or both States.

"(3) The conservation pool will be operated for the benefit of water users in Colorado and Kansas, both upstream and downstream from John Martin Dam, as provided in this Compact. The maintenance of John Martin Dam and appurtenant works may at times require the Corps of Engineers to release waters then impounded in the conservation pool or to prohibit the storage of water therein until such maintenance work is completed. Flood control operation may also involve temporary utilization of conservation storage.

"D. This Compact is not intended to impede or prevent future beneficial development of the Arkansas River basin in Colorado and Kansas by Federal or State agencies, by private enterprise, or by combinations thereof, which may involve construction of dams, reservoirs, and other works for the purposes of water utilization and control, as well as the improved or prolonged functioning or existing works: Provided, that the water of the Arkansas River, as defined in Article III, shall not be materially depleted in usable quantity or availability for use to the water users in Colorado and Kansas under this Compact by such future development or construction.

"ARTICLE V

"Colorado and Kansas hereby agree upon the following basis of apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River:

"A. Winter storage in John Martin Reservoir shall commence on November 1st of each and continue to and include the next succeeding March 31st. During said period all water entering said reservoir up to the limit of the then available conservation capacity shall be store: Provided, that Colorado may demand releases of water equivalent to the river flow, but such releases shall not exceed 100 c.f.s. (cubic feet per second) and water so released shall be used without avoidable waste.

"B. Summer storage in John Martin Reservoir shall commence on April 1st of each year and continue to and include the next succeeding October 31st. During said period, except when Colorado water users are operating under decreed priorities as provided in paragraphs F and G of this Article, all water entering said reservoir up to the limit of the then available conservation capacity shall be stored: Provided, that Colorado may demand releases of water equivalent to the river flow up to 500 c.f.s., and Kansas may demand releases of water equivalent to that portion of the river flow between 500 c.f.s. and 750 c.f.s., irrespective of releases demanded by Colorado.

"C. Releases of water stored pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs A and B of this article shall be made upon demands by Colorado and Kansas concurrently or separately at any time during the summer storage period. Unless increases to meet extraordinary conditions are authorized by the administration, separate releases of stored water to Colorado shall not exceed 750 c.f.s., separate releases of stored water to Kansas shall not exceed 500 c.f.s., and concurrent releases of stored water shall not exceed a total of 1,250 c.f.s.: *Provided,* That when water stored in the conservation pool is reduced to a quantity less than 20,000 acre-feet, separate releases of stored water to Colorado shall not exceed 600 c.f.s., separate releases of stored water to Kansas shall not exceed 400 c.f.s., and concurrent releases of stored water shall not exceed 1,000 c.f.s.

"D. Releases authorized by paragraphs A, B and C of this Article, except when all Colorado water users are operating under decreed priorities as provided in paragraphs F and G of this article, shall not impose any call on Colorado water users that divert waters of the Arkansas River upstream from John Martin Dam.

"E. (1) Releases of stored water and releases of river flow may be made simultaneously upon the demands of either or both States.

"(2) Water released upon concurrent or separate demands shall be applied promptly to beneficial use unless storage thereof downstream is authorized by the administration.

"(3) Releases of river flow and of stored water to Colorado shall be measured by gaging stations located at or near John Martin Dam and the releases to which Kansas is entitled shall be satisfied by an equivalent in State line flow.

"(4) When water is released from John Martin Reservoir appropriate allowances as determined by the administration shall be made for the intervals of time required for

such water to arrive at the points of diversion in Colorado and at the State line.

"(5) There shall be no allowance or accumulation of credits or debits for or against either State.

"(6) Storage, releases from storage and releases of river flow authorized in this article shall be accomplished pursuant to procedures prescribed by the administration under the provisions of article VIII.

"F. In the event the Administration finds that within a period of fourteen (14) days the water in the conservation pool will be or is liable to be exhausted, the Administration shall forthwith notify the State Engineer of Colorado, or his duly authorized representative, that commencing upon a day certain within said fourteen (14) day period, unless a change of conditions justifies cancellation or modification of such notice, Colorado shall administer the decreed rights of water users in Colorado Water District 67 as against each other and as against all rights now or hereafter decreed to water users diverting upstream from John Martin Dam on the basis of relative priorities in the same manner in which their respective priority rights were administered by Colorado before John Martin Reservoir began to operate and as though John Martin Dam had not been constructed. Such priority administration by Colorado shall be continued until the Administration finds that water is again available in the conservation pool for release as provided in this Compact, and timely notice of such finding shall be given by the Administration to the State Engineer of Colorado or his duty authorized representative: Provided, that except as controlled by the operation of the preceding provisions of this paragraph and other applicable provisions of this Compact, when there is water in the conservation pool the water users upstream from John Martin Reservoir shall not be affected by the decrees to the ditches in Colorado Water District 67. Except when administration in Colorado is on a priority basis the water diversions in Colorado Water District 67 shall be administered by Colorado in accordance with distribution agreements made from time to time between the water users in such District and filed with the Administration and with the State Engineer of Colorado or, in the absence of such agreement, upon the basis of the respective priority decrees, as against each other, in said District.

"G. During periods when Colorado reverts to administration of decreed priorities, Kansas shall not be entitled to any portion of the river flow entering John Martin Reservoir. Waters of the Arkansas River originating in Colorado which may flow across the Stateline during such periods are hereby apportioned to Kansas.

"H. If the usable quantity and availability for use of the waters of the Arkansas River to water users in Colorado Water District 67 and Kansas will be thereby materially depleted or adversely affected, (1) priority rights now decreed to the ditches of Colorado Water District 67 shall not hereafter be transferred to other water districts in Colorado or to points of diversion or places of use upstream from John Martin Dam; and (2) the ditch diversion rights from the Arkansas River in Colorado Water District 67 and of Kansas ditches between the Stateline and Garden City shall not hereafter be increased beyond the total present rights of said ditches, without the Administration, in either case (1) or (2), making findings of fact that no such depletion or adverse effect will result from such proposed transfer or increase. Notice of legal proceedings for any such proposed transfer or increase shall be given to the Administration in the manner and within the time provided by the laws of Colorado or Kansas in such cases.

"ARTICLE VI

"A. (1) Nothing in this Compact shall be construed as impairing the jurisdiction of Kansas over the waters of the Arkansas River that originate in Kansas and over the waters that flow from Colorado across the Stateline into Kansas.

"(2) Except as otherwise provided, nothing in this Compact shall be construed as supplanting the administration by Colorado of the rights of appropriators of waters of the Arkansas River in said State as decreed to said appropriators by the courts of Colorado, nor as interfering with the distribution among said appropriators by Colorado, nor as curtailing the diversion and use for irrigation and other beneficial purposes in Colorado of the waters of the Arkansas River.

"B. Inasmuch as the Frontier Canal diverts waters of the Arkansas River in Colorado west of the Stateline for irrigation uses in Kansas only, Colorado concedes to Kansas and Kansas hereby assumes exclusive administrative control over the operation of the Frontier Canal and its headworks for such purposes, to the same extent as though said works were located entirely within the State of Kansas. Water carried across the State line in the Frontier Canal or any other similarly situated canal shall be considered to be part of the Stateline flow.

"ARTICLE VII

"A. Each State shall be subject to the terms of this Compact. Where the name of the State or the term 'State' is used in this Compact these shall be construed to include any person or entity of any nature whatsoever using, claiming or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Arkansas River under the authority of that State.

"B. This Compact establishes no general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

"C. Wherever any State or Federal official or agency is referred to in this Compact such reference shall apply to the comparable official or agency succeeding to their duties and functions.

"ARTICLE VIII

"A. To administer the provisions of this Compact there is hereby created an interstate agency to be known as the Arkansas River Compact Administration herein designated as 'the Administration'.

"B. The Administration shall have power to:

"(1) Adopt, amend, and revoke bylaws, rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this Compact;

"(2) Prescribe procedures for the administration of this compact: *Provided,* That where such procedures involve the operation of John Martin Reservoir Project they shall be subject to the approval of the district engineer in charge of said project;

"(3) Perform all functions required to implement this Compact and to do all things necessary, proper or convenient in the performance of its duties.

"C. The membership of the Administration shall consist of three representatives from each State who shall be appointed by the respective Governors for a term not to exceed four years. One Colorado representative shall be a resident of and water right owner in Water Districts 14 or 17, one Colorado representative shall be a resident of and water right owner in Water District 67, and one Colorado representative shall be the Director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board. Two Kansas representatives shall be residents of and water right owners in the counties of Finney, Kearney, or Hamilton, and one Kansas representative shall be the chief State official charged with the administration of water rights in Kansas. The President of the United States is hereby requested to designate a representative of the United States, and if a representative is so designated he shall be an ex-officio member and act as chairman of the Administration without vote.

"D. The State representatives shall be appointed by the respective Governors within 30 days after the effective date of this Compact. The Administration shall meet and organize within 60 days after such effective date. A quorum for any meeting shall consist of four members of the Administration: Provided, that at least two members are present from each State. Each State shall have but one vote in the Administration and every decision, authorization or other action shall require unanimous vote. In case of a divided vote on any matter within the purview of the Administration, the Administration may, by subsequent unanimous vote, refer the matter for arbitration to the Representative of the United States or other arbitrator or arbitrators, in which event the decision made by such arbitrator or arbitrators shall be binding upon the Administration.

"E. (1) The salaries, if any, and the personal expenses of each member shall be paid by the Government which he represents. All other expenses incident to the administration of this Compact which are not paid by the United States shall be borne by the States on the basis of 60 percent by Colorado and 40 percent by Kansas.

"(2) In each even numbered year the Administration shall adopt and transmit to the Governor of each State its budget covering anticipated expenses for the forthcoming biennium and the amount thereof payable by each State. Each State shall appropriate and pay the amount due by it to the Administration.

"(3) The Administration shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements and shall include a statement thereof, together with a certificate of audit by a certified public accountant, in its annual report. Each State shall have the right to make an examination and audit of the accounts of the Administration at any time.

"F. Each State shall provide such available facilities, equipment and other assistance as the Administration may need to carry out its duties. To supplement such available assistance the Administration may employ engineering, legal, clerical and other aid as in its judgment may be necessary for the performance of its functions. Such employees shall be paid by and be responsible to the Administration, and shall not be considered to be employees of either State.

"G. (1) The Administration shall cooperate with the chief official of each State charged with the administration of water rights and with Federal agencies in the systematic determination and correlation of the facts as to the flow and diversion of the waters of the Arkansas River and as to the operation and siltation of John Martin Reservoir and other related structures. The Administration shall cooperate in the procurement, interchange, compilation and publication of all factual data bearing upon the administration of this Compact without, in general, duplicating measurements, observations or publications made by State or Federal agencies. State officials shall furnish pertinent factual data to the Administration upon its request. The Administration shall, with the collaboration of the appropriate Federal and State agencies, determine as may be necessary from time to time, the location of gaging stations required for the proper administration of this Compact and shall designate the official records of such stations for its official use.

"(2) The Director, U.S. Geological Survey, the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, are hereby requested to collaborate with the administration and with appropriate State officials in the systematic determination and correlation of data referred to in paragraph G (1) of this Article and in the execution of other

duties of such officials which may be necessary for the proper administration of this Compact.

"(3) If deemed necessary for the administration of this Compact, the Administration may require the installation and maintenance, at the expense of water users, of measuring devices of approved type in any ditch or group of ditches diverting water from the Arkansas River in Colorado or Kansas. The chief official of each State charged with the administration of water rights shall supervise the execution of the Administration's requirements for such installations.

"H. Violation of any of the provisions of this Compact or other actions prejudicial thereto which come to the attention of the Administration shall be promptly investigated by it. When deemed advisable as the result of such investigation, the Administration may report its findings and recommendations to the State official who is charged with the administration of water rights for appropriate action, it being the intent of this Compact that enforcement of its terms shall be accomplished in general through the State agencies and officials charged with the administration of water rights.

"I. Findings of fact made by the Administration shall not be conclusive in any court or before any agency or tribunal but shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found.

"J. The Administration shall report annually to the Governors of the States and to the President of the United States as to matters within its purview.

"ARTICLE IX

"A. This Compact shall become effective when ratified by the Legislature of each State and when consented to by the Congress of the United States by legislation providing substantially, among other things, as follows:

"'Nothing contained in this Act or in the Compact herein consented to shall be construed as impairing or affecting the sovereignty of the United States or any of its rights or jurisdiction in and over the area or waters which are the subject of such Compact: *Provided,* That the Chief of Engineers is hereby authorized to operate the conservation features of the John Martin Reservoir project in a manner conforming to such Compact with such exceptions as he and the Administration created pursuant to the Compact may jointly approve.'

"B. This Compact shall remain in effect until modified or terminated by unanimous action of the States and in the event of modification or termination all rights then established or recognized by this Compact shall continue unimpaired.

"In Witness whereof, The commissioners have signed this Compact in triplicate original, one of which shall be forwarded to the Secretary of State of the United States of America and one of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each signatory State.

"Done in the City and County of Denver, in the state of Colorado, on the 14th day of December, in the Year of our Lord 1948.

"HENRY C. VIDAL,
"GAIL L. IRELAND,
"HARRY B. MENDENHALL,
"Commissioners for Colorado.
"GEORGE S. KNAPP,
"EDWARD F. ARN,
"WILLIAM E. LEAVITT,
"ROLAND H. TATE,
"Commissioners for Kansas.

"Attest:

"WARDEN L. NOE,
"Secretary.

"Approved.

"HANS KRAMER,
"Representative of the United States."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this Act or in the compact herein consented to shall be construed as impairing or affecting the sovereignty of the United States or any of its rights or jurisdiction in and over the area or waters which are the subject of such compact: *Provided,* That the Chief of Engineers is hereby authorized to operate the conservation features of the John Martin Reservoir project in a manner conforming to such compact with such exceptions as he and the Administration created pursuant to the compact may jointly approve.

Approved May 31, 1949.

COVER MENDENHALL, ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Rocky Ford, Colo., August 2, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator from Colorado,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Thank you for your letter of July 29 enclosing copy of letter dated July 28, 1965 to Mr. Felix L. Sparks.

After reading it, I think you have taken the only logical position that can be taken by one interested in the development of southeastern Colorado. There is no question in my mind as to the desirability of a permanent pool in John Martin Reservoir. I think probably an equal amount of water for that purpose would have greater economic benefit to the area than an equal amount of water used for irrigation purposes. It goes without saying that the recreational advantages to the area would be great in addition to the economic advantages, which are created by people seeking recreation.

However, there is the unfortunate truth that at the time the dam was built and planned the various recreation type agencies were not interested in it and no provision was made for such use. As you know even better than I, the rights to that water then vested in irrigators and municipal corporations. To attempt to deprive any of those people of those rights at this time would be closely akin to declaring the homestead act void in retrospect.

If, and only if, there is other water which can be made available to maintain a permanent pool without injury through lack of return flow, etc., from the change in use of that other water, I would be wholeheartedly in favor of the pool. As you mentioned to Mr. Sparks, a "hole" always seems to appear in the river. I am not sure whether this is because of archaic administration, unanticipated appropriation of water or just whatever, but I do know that it appears and must be avoided because often the loss of water to an irrigator at a critical period can lose him his crop for a year.

If there is anything that I can do to aid or assist in anyway in the resolution of these differences, I would be most happy to do so.

Very sincerely yours,

COVER.

THE FORT BENT DITCH CO.,
Lamar, Colo., August 3, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
c/o Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: Thank you very much for your good letter of the 29th ulto, and for the interest you show in our problem here of a permanent pool in the John Martin Reservoir.

Needless to say, we of the Fort Bent Ditch Co., as well as all other ditches below John Martin, are against any permanent pool. We can't see where it would be possible, even though the State Game and Fish Department bought water for that purpose, to maintain and regulate the reservoir so there would be a permanent pool of 10,000 or 20,000 acrefeet. The factor of seepage and of evaporation would be so great (and so indeterminable) that we can't see how it could be maintained, and at the same time give us the water that we might need for the purpose of growing crops.

I might add here that after we all attended your called meeting at the district courtroom in the courthouse here, on January 31, 1964, we all felt pretty good about this deal, because of your promise made there. Then later on, after Frank Evans was elected as Representative from this district, he called a meeting of the Ditch companies and water users (I don't remember the date) in the rear room of Bosley's cafe here in Lamar, at which there must have been some 50 or 60 present, and at that time he made the statement that he would not introduce, or support, a bill in favor of a permanent pool. However, from what the press says, he did introduce the bill, and I am informed that he is working to have such a bill passed by the House. I can't go along with such tactics as this. I would like to see a man stick with his convictions, and not be "wishy-washy" and try to ride both sides of the fence in a matter that is as important as this one is.

You are correct in that the Arkansas is the most overappropriated river in the State of Colorado, and we here at the lower end of the valley need this water to raise crops, rather than to use what we need for irrigation for recreational purposes.

Our board of directors will meet this coming Saturday evening, and I will read your letters to them when they meet, and I am sure that they will be pleased to know that you are still looking after the interests of the farmers below John Martin.

I know that Felix Sparks is out working mighty hard to have a permanent pool created above the dam, but we here below the dam are all interested in irrigation. Sure, we would like to have a place to fish and boat ride, but we feel that raising crops is a whole lot more essential than fishing and boating, and especially when we have other places in this territory where fishing and boating are available.

Again I want to thank you for your letter, and for your stand for agriculture versus recreation.

With kindest personal regards to both you and Welda, from Joyce and myself, I am,

Your very sincerely,

GROVER L. CARRICO,
President.

HOLLY, COLO.,
August 30, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLOTT: Thank you very much for information concerning the actions on a permanent pool in John Martin.

I could probably write a very large book on reasons why I do not want the permanent pool, but I'll say a permanent pool would be an asset to the valley. It is doubtful that I mention anything that you do not already know and possibly more about it.

We know the U.S. Government is pushing recreational projects all over the United States and rightly so. I would think local citizens should know the needs of their particular locality. However, in case of permanent pool in John Martin it is very apparent that the sportsmen that are pushing it are doing so out of spite or mockery. A few years ago it was necessary to drain the reservoir to meet irrigating needs and to help in cleaning some of the mud from the lake. At that time many fish lost their home. Most was caught by the public. I myself got about one hundred pounds, all carp. I tried to find a game fish but got none. Nevertheless the pool pushers made big news of the tons of fish the "dirty" farmers has destroyed. The fact the fish and game department went to great cost to seine and destroy tons of carp from other pools nearby seemed all fair and good to the sportsmen maybe we farmers should have charged the taxpayers for our services.

If this pool was capable of creating any recreational facilities and harboring some game fish, I for one would be for it. It can never be anything but a mud hole. Where is the shoreline? Where is the sandy beach? Where are the trees? Where is the wading pool? Swimming pool? and picnic grounds, etc.? At present the permanent pool has about 400,000 acre-feet of water on top of it. When this water is lowered to leave the 10,000 acre-feet permanent pool it will take a full year for the mud beach to dry so the lake can be reached. I would like a pool, but by all means not a big mud flat down under a changing reservoir.

It is understandable why we have all carp and no game fish in this valley. Water that has been held 2 weeks or more becomes very strong with chemicals that are severe on humans as well as fish. One needs experience only a few days of irrigating in this water and note how the hands crack open to bleeding depth within the first day.

Sure a permanent pool will work just fine for the next year due to the fact that there is plenty of water, and no one knows the difference whether there is a pool or not. The backers don't need the pool; the farmers don't need the water. Only when the farmers need the water badly will the pool be needed. Why not direct pool backers attention to an off stream storage or another dam on the river. It seems unfair to the cities of Lamar, Granada, Holly, and many others for flood control to be impaired by robbing it of 10,000 acre-feet. Surely the past 3 months has proven that more flood control is needed; also enough water has run by this summer to more than fill another John Martin.

Your letter to Mr. Sparks, July 28, proves to me you are on guard for all interest. Page 2 states a permanent pool was tried and failed. You seem right in stating that upper river couldn't let water go by when they were dry. I noted once last month report gave 3,000 second-feet passing Pueblo; 500 second-feet passing Las Animas, this 2,500 second-feet being used in a rainy spell with lighter demands in the upper divisions.

Too, in considering the evaporation; that alone could ruin everything for the pool. I believe the Amity Canal has records to show that they at one time stored an amount of water in the lakes north of Lamar. From 18 months to 2 years later 75 percent had been lost. The canal recovered only 25 percent of its stockpile. Records should be available also to show that the river flow was not sufficient to supply a 10,000 acre-feet permanent pool, plus evaporation for the summer of 1964.

It is also my opinion that the Colorado Fish and Game Department would welcome the chance to point out to the public that a fish pool in John Martin is of the lowest possible value to anyone. The great expense to the taxpayers to change this thing should by all means be used toward something with recreational features. Tourists would certainly sneer at a mud flat with not a shade in 2 miles.

I appreciate your efforts for trying to stage some hearings in this valley and will welcome the chance to attend any and all that may be scheduled.

Hoping to see you on your return to Lamar.

Sincerely yours,

PALMER P. PENDERGRAFT.

THE ROCKY FORD DITCH CO.,
Rocky Ford, Colo., October 13, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Under direction of the board of directors of the Rocky Ford Ditch Co., I have been instructed to advise you our company is not opposed to a permanent pool at the John Martin Dam. We do, however, feel strongly that this has to be done in such a way that it does not interfere with the irrigation or ditch company priorities and operation of the Arkansas River. Our company concurs with your handling of this and wish to express our thanks for the manner in which you are working out this issue.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM MADONNA,
Secretary-Treasurer.

THE COLORADO FUEL & IRON CORP.,
Denver, Colo., August 27, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of July 29, 1965, addressed to Mr. S. A. Ott, vice president of operations, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. I am taking the liberty of answering that letter since I recently assumed the position of vice president in charge of operations.

We have given serious thought to the questions and matters discussed in your letter of July 28 to Mr. Sparks. Needless to say, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. has a vital interest in the matter of water rights in the Arkansas Valley and we appreciate having the opportunity of making a few comments.

We have become increasingly concerned for the last few years with regard to the protection of Colorado Fuel & Iron's water rights from the Arkansas and its tributaries. There are various reasons for this concern, but among these are the problem of the enforcement and protection of water priorities in the entire river system and the adverse effect on existing water rights resulting from wells which are permitted to draw water from sources which are tributary to the river.

With specific regard to the establishment of a permanent recreational pool in the John Martin Reservoir, we feel that any such action must be taken very carefully and only with proper regard to and safeguards for the protection of existing water rights. Certainly water for any such permanent recreational pool should be acquired from existing sources and should be used in a manner that would not adversely affect the vested rights of other water users. What I am saying is basically that if a permanent recreational pool is to be established, water must be purchased for this purpose and when the use and point of diversion of the water are changed for this purpose, such must be accomplished in accordance with basic Colorado water law. This would mean that there could not be any enlarged use and that other appropriators would not be adversely affected. Specifically, the new use should not result in any greater call on the river or in any existing appropriator having the conditions changed insofar as the water available for his appropriation is concerned.

In line with the foregoing, it would seem that careful consideration should be given as to the point from which the water was taken to supply the permanent recreational pool. If an irrigation right were acquired, then the land which had been previously irrigated by this right would presumably have to be retired as irrigated land. Here again we might have the problem of wells being drilled to make up for the loss of water involved in the surface right that was sold. If these wells were tributary to the stream, there could be an adverse effect on existing appropriators. If the water right were acquired from a user below the John Martin Reservoir, particular attention should be given to the question of whether appropriators above the reservoir would be injured.

As I have said, we are basically concerned with the strict enforcement of priorities in the Arkansas River to protect existing appropriators and with the complete recognition of basic water law principles having to do with change of use and change of point of diversion in connection with the acquisition of any water right and its transfer to the reservoir for the permanent recreational pool.

We note you suggest that there be hearings on the matter in the area before any definitive action is taken. This, we feel, would be advisable in almost any case, but it is particularly so in connection with any proceedings on the Arkansas River at this time due to the many controversies and problems that exist.

We do appreciate having the opportunity to comment to you and will look forward to hearing further regarding developments in this matter.

Very truly yours,

CLAY CRAWFORD.

WELBORN, DUFFORD & COOK,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Denver, Colo., August 31, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: This is in reply to your letter of July 29 with which you sent me a copy of your letter of July 28 to Mr. Sparks dealing with the John Martin Reservoir situation.

I consulted with Mr. C. Clay Crawford, vice president in charge of operations of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., in regard to his letter of August 27, 1965, to you on the same subject. I concur in the views expressed by Mr. Crawford.

The basic concern which I have as a representative of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. and also as an attorney interested in water law is with the administration of water rights in the Arkansas Valley. As you know, the Colorado Legislature this past spring enacted significant legislation dealing with underground water. It is expected that these new laws will not only clarify the authority of the State engineer and his department but will also provide the State engineer with additional power to deal with waters which are tributary to a natural stream.

Perhaps the most serious problem that has confronted surface appropriators in recent years is the encroachment upon the water available to satisfy their priorities as a result of pumping from wells which are either in the bed of the Arkansas River or which are drawing from sources tributary to it. Many of these wells have been permitted to take water without regard to priorities and thus adversely affect surface appropriators. This adverse effect is felt by Colorado Fuel & Iron even though its water rights are upstream a great distance from the well diversions. The reason for this, of course, is that appropriators upstream are required to curtail their diversions to satisfy senior appropriators downstream whose source of water has been depleted by wells.

I am not thoroughly familiar with the John Martin Reservoir problem and all of its ramifications. Of course it would be desirable from many standpoints to establish a recreation pool in that reservoir to benefit people who can derive pleasure from it. Certainly the establishment of any pool must, however, be achieved with due recognition of the constitutional and statutory rights of other water uses.

I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on this important matter. If there is anything further I can do, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

BOB WELBORN.

BRISTOL, COLO.,
August 26, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: I received your letter of July 29 and also a copy of the letter you sent to Mr. Felix Sparks in regard to the permanent pool behind John Martin Dam.

I am in full accord with the principles you have stated in this letter and I do not think any action should be taken to secure a permanent pool without a public hearing to protect the interest of all.

No person who is familiar with this area could conscientiously say that irrigators below the dam would not be adversely affected by a permanent pool.

It is my belief that ditches above the dam benefit more from the dam than those below. In periods of drought I believe that the dam is a definite liability to irrigators below, because under the provisions of the Arkansas River compact the upstream ditches run the winter water while those below cannot get any from November 1 to April 1.

I would like to thank you for your interest in this matter and appreciate your efforts to represent all the people.

Very truly yours,

ORVILLE HOPKINS.

MANZANOLA, COLO.,
August 23, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: In reply to your letter of July 29, 1965, enclosing a copy of your letter to Mr. Felix L. Sparks, I wish to say that I am very pleased with the attitude you have taken on all of these irrigation problems.

It appears that you favor a permanent recreational pool at the John Martin only in case that certain problems are properly solved beforehand. I think this is so important that the recreation pool should not be built unless these problems you suggest are previously correctly solved.

I think that holding a public hearing in the area is one of the important things that should be done before any legislation is passed by the Senate.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. VROMAN, Jr.

HOLLY, COLO.,
August 14, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with your stand on the water situation at John Martin Dam. I feel that you will do everything possible to protect our water rights.

I am not interested in boating or fishing, but I am vitally interested in irrigation water.

Sincerely,

PHILIP FLINT.

CRUIKSHANK FARMS,
Granada, Colo., August 23, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: I am sorry that I am late in answering your letter but it was missent to Koen and I just now received your correspondence.

This fish pool question is still a hot topic of conversation in the lower Arkansas Valley; however, the sentiment compared to a few years ago when you had the hearing in the Prowers County courthouse has changed quite a bit in favor of the pool. I would say that half of the irrigators in all the ditch companies except the Amity would be in favor of a permanent pool providing the necessary water rights could be obtained and a solution could be worked out on the administration of the pool. Perhaps the best idea is your own suggestion that they hold hearings in the valley. I think this is a must.

We all appreciate very much your interest in this matter and know that you will look out after our interests.

Best regards,

C. G. CRUIKSHANK.

HARTMAN, COLO.,
August 19, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: Thank you for your letter of July 28, relative to your stand on a permanent pool and your letter to Mr. Felix Sparks. Thank you for taking a long look at the different angles which would be created by the establishment of a permanent pool.

I feel that the majority of the people below the dam would favor a permanent pool, if a feasible plan could be adopted which would not jeopardize the lifeblood of our economy. Such a plan would have to include such items as (1) revamping our system of water administration to the extent that changes in flow of streams could be affected every 6 to 8 hours instead of every 20 hours, (2) relatively accurate gaging stations with more frequent reports given on same, (3) a supervisor, who could be hired by the ditches below the dam at a nominal cost to each to work concurrently with upstream interests, to more efficiently distribute water to those who have a legal right to same, (4) a clause for evaporation, such a clause would by necessity of its nature, have to be worked out with engineers who have some formula which would most nearly fit our climatic conditions. Several other aspects should be given consideration but I am sure that with a meeting or series of meetings among intelligent men a set of operating principles could be arrived at which would be of best interests to all concerned.

Let's not leave a stone unturned, lest we injure the rights of someone anywhere along the Arkansas. If I may be of any service please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

WILFORD O. RANDLE.

HOLLY, COLO.,
August 10, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLOTT: In reply to your letter to Mr. Felix Sparks. I am opposed to the permanent pool, mainly because the operating procedure could cost us a great loss of water. Many times during the dry years the dam would be empty, then receive a rain impounding some water in the dam, as the dam was going empty, we would call for our riverflow. Sometimes 1 to 2 days of water are lost because the water was not released soon enough. During the dry years this occurs often, so the river would have to be administered very careful.

Also in a dry period, on the Amity Canal, during a 24-hour period the amount of cubic feet may vary from none up to 500 and back to 100 or an amount similar. Do you think the Army Engineers would raise and close the gates so that we could run water in this manner? This is a long way from normal but does happen and sometimes on holidays and Sundays. Would the Army Engineers handle this?

If the permanent pool becomes a reality, I agree with you 100 percent, on having the ditches handle the operating principles.

I was in Denver about 2 years ago to attend a Colorado Water Conservation Board meeting. Jim Romer was spokesman for the Amity Ditch Co. at the meeting. His argument opposing the pool was: we would not receive the silt, which would settle in the dam. In irrigating, a certain amount of silt is much more beneficial and too much silt prevents the water from soaking in the ground, causing the water to just run off.

In my understanding, in agreeing for the permanent pool, then finding it would not work satisfactory, we would be stuck with it.

Yours very truly,

FLOYD THOMPSON.

QUINN OIL CO.,
Lamar, Colo., August 12, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: Thanks for your letter and invitation for my comments on the permanent pool at John Martin. We are all aware of the fact that the Arkansas Valley is farming area, and the water to this community is a very important item. People who own land with ditch rights should be considered, because these rights date back for a good many years.

GORDON, there is something else that we have to consider in our thinking on the water problem. That is the domestic use of water. The homes, businesses and industries are using more and more water and here in Lamar our long range outlook isn't very bright. This necessitates a good look be given to this problem.

Frankly, GORDON, it is hard to tell you anything that is new on the water problem for southeast Colorado. Not only have you served on a ditch company's board, but you have kept up with the water problems in the area admirably. However, I would like to express a few thoughts on the various problems.

Hunting, fishing, boating, camping, and picnicking bring a lot of money into our area. It is about 200 miles to the mountains and we feel that this part of the State should have more to offer in the way of recreation facilities. I think John Martin Lake with a permanent pool would help provide this.

Poor management of our water is another problem. There is enough water wasted in opening and closing the gates at the dam to provide water for a permanent pool. It is my wish that a permanent pool be created at John Martin Lake and that a closer and better management of all our water be put into force. New laws should be created for the ditch companies at the same time so that they won't suffer unduly by the changes made with an established permanent pool. It is my hope that all these aforementioned changes would provide a better business climate and a more enjoyable place to live in southeast Colorado.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. QUINN.

ORDWAY, COLO.,
August 6, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: I have received a copy of your letter dated July 28, 1965, to Felix L. Sparks in relation to the proposed permanent pool in John Martin Reservoir for recreation purposes.

Referring to paragraph 1 on page 3, and to the last paragraph on page 3 of the aforesaid letter, you have therein clearly outlined the problems in connection with the establishment and operation of such a pool, with but one exception.

In order to protect vested rights along the river and to overcome any legitimate complaints from these water users it is the opinion of a number of us that (1) we must know the source, or sources, from which water will be obtained to make the initial pool filling of 10,000 acre-feet, or whatever amount is selected, (2) we must know the source, or sources, from which water will be secured to offset annual losses to the pool from evaporation and seepage.

In relation to items 1 and 2 above it is my opinion that such a pool can only be established and maintained by purchases of water imported from Colorado's western slope, or from some other source foreign to the Arkansas River surface water basin. It is not to fantastic to propose that the original pool be established with imported sur-

face water and, following its establishment, seepage, and evaporation losses be replaced annually through the use of water from wells.

In relation to the possible purchase of such imported water for this purpose and, had an agreement to purchase been previously negotiated, the pool could easily have been filled this current year. A municipality and two irrigation companies on the Arkansas River, who import western slope water, were forced to waste thousands of acre-feet of such water because of the lack of reservoir storage space. This is, of course, a tremendous water year because of the series of floods and because of the very high water content of the snow pack in the mountains.

A possible source of water to establish and maintain such a pool could be the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District at such time as it has imported water for sale. John Martin Reservoir is theoretically eligible for such purchase since it lies within the said district.

We are entirely sympathetic to the need and desire of these people for such a recreational facility in the area and we know many of them are very puzzled and quite upset because to date they have failed to get any concrete results.

Please feel free to contact us if we can be of assistance.

Very truly yours,

THE TWIN LAKES RESERVOIR & CANAL CO.
WALLACE A. DOE,
General Manager and Engineer.

HARTMAN, COLO.,
August 12, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended on your stand concerning the permanent pool at John Martin Dam.

As you have consistently said, until the river regulations are changed and better gauging stations maintained the residents below the dam would surely be the losers in dry times, which seems to be the case about 90 percent of the time.

Again, thanks for sticking to your beliefs against a lot of pressure.

Respectfully yours.

N. L. MCTAGGART.

P.S.—Farmer below the dam who likes to fish as well as any one.

DONOHOE CHEVROLET CO.,
Holly, Colo., August 7, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: In regard to your letter of July 29, 1965 concerning my comments on your letter to Mr. Felix Sparks I find that I am in complete accord with you.

As you well know, agriculture is the base of our whole economy here in southeastern Colorado and the conservation of water is of prime importance to everyone.

I have talked to many people, farmers, businessmen, employees, etc., and I have yet to find anyone who is not in favor of a permanent pool behind John Martin Dam. These people all realize its signifiance and its potential for recreation for themselves and as an added attraction for tourists.

As you can understand most townspeople are not very much interested in the ways or means of such a pool, they just want it one way or another.

The farmers, on the other hand, are in favor of a permanent pool only if it will not deprive them of their legal rights.

I have talked to the superintendent of the Amity Mutual Irrigation Co., Mr. Bill Howland, and he said that they have no objection to the pool but the reason they have balked so far to the idea is that the game and fish department has not indicated to them where the water will come from and how it will be administered when they do get it.

I think that as soon as the question of the availability of the water is settled and a set of operating principles have been drawn up you will have no conflict with anyone. I know that it will be difficult to satisfy everyone and I wish I had an easy solution to the problem but I am not well enough acquainted with the law and how you go about getting things like this done.

GORDON, we want and need this permanent pool behind John Martin Dam and I know you will do everything in your power to see that we get it and that it will be in the best interest of the people of southeastern Colorado.

I hope I have been of some assistance in this matter.

JOHN DONOHOE.

LA JUNTA, COLO.,
August 5, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: I have reviewed your letter of July 28, 1965, directed to Larry Sparks concerning a permanent pool at John Martin. As you know, I represent the Holbrook Mutual Irrigating Co., which diverts water above the dam with a rather late priority.

Our concern with regard to a permanent pool is not so much the source of water which creates the pool, but the source which will replenish it. The only thing that I have heard is that water will be bought to replenish evaporation and seepage loss. The source of this purchased water is of prime concern to us. If water rights are acquired from an appropriator diverting below Pueblo, then one must consider the loss to the river of the return flow.

I am aware of any number of small decrees in the Canon City area and if such a water right were acquired, the accompanying transportation and shrinkage problem is immediately apparent. Unless the items above mentioned are given consideration by the conservationists, I am sure that upstream appropriations would be deprived of water which would be rightfully theirs in order to maintain a permanent pool.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH N. WADLEIGH,
Attorney-at-Law.

ROCKY FORD, COLO.,
August 6, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter addressed to me under date of July 29, 1965, together with a copy of your letter to Mr. Felix L. Sparks relative to a voluntary conservation pool of 8,000 acre-feet proposed to be retained in the John Martin Reservoir.

I have read your letter to Mr. Sparks several times and it is my opinion that your position as therein related is sound and reasonable. I presumed to discuss this letter at length with members of the board of directors of the Catlin Canal Co. They took no official action thereon for the reason that none was asked. I inferred that they took no exception to your position as therein stated.

The president of Catlin Co. expressed his unqualified opinion to the effect that he, personally, would not consent to such a pool until it shall have been made clearly to appear who will contribute the water and from what source it will come. Following the establishment of the above points, he would then, personally, insist on knowing who would operate the same and the plan of operation thereof.

It seems to me that this position coincides with the position you took in the letter to Mr. Sparks and that such a position is a very sound one for the reasons stated in your said letter.

Extending warm personal regards and best wishes, I am

Respectfully and sincerely,

PERRY E. WILLIAMS,
Attorney-at-law.

GUYMON, OKLA.,
August 6, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: I appreciate your letter of July 29 enclosing a copy of your letter to Mr. Felix Sparks concerning the action taken by the Colorado Conservation Board on July 12. I appreciate your statements in regard to the permanent pool in John Martin Reservoir. I know you understand the problem of being on the end of an irrigation ditch or the end of the river.

I would like to comment on the meeting July 23 in Lamar, Colo., of the Colorado-Kansas Compact Commission at which Mr. Sparks represented the State of Colorado. In pushing quite hard for a resolution favoring a permanent pool, he made the statement that the water belonged to the United States Government and they could do with it what they saw fit. He also stated that he would consider no permanent pool of any type on any side stream until the permanent pool was in John Martin Reservoir.

I have always said there may be places off the main stem of the Arkansas River where recreation areas may be bought for fewer dollar expended and not complicate the administration of the main stem.

When a man refuses to consider a project on its merits and so publicly states that he will not listen to any until they please him with a permanent pool in John Martin and who says that the water does not belong to the States with the right of appropriation thereof, he is not a fit person to represent the State of Colorado in negotiations between States. If Mr. Sparks represents the opinion of the State water board, this board may well be disbanded and all instructions for the administration of water shall come from Washington.

This is not the first water meeting in Colorado where Felix Sparks has been off base in his statements and he is a black eye to States rights. I certainly recommend that he be removed from any position representing the water rights of Colorado.

Yours truly,

JIM ROMER.

HOLLY, COLO.,
August 6, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: I appreciate your consideration in sending me the correspondence concerning a permanent pool in John Martin Reservoir. This issue is of vital concern to the southeast Colorado area and most people, including myself, below the dam, are in complete agreement with your position of insisting that operating principles be included in any legislation. The pool would undoubtedly bring recreational benefits, but I believe such benefits could only accrue at the expense of irrigators and water appropriators in the Arkansas Valley.

Sincerely,

EVLLYN COX.

ROCKY FORD, COLO.,
August 6, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Thank you for sending the information on a permanent pool

at John Martin Reservoir. I have read with interest your comments on this problem and its possible solution.

I was happy to learn that you were in favor of a permanent pool if it can be obtained without injury to existing property rights of irrigators in the Arkansas Valley. It has been my observation that the irrigators also favor a permanent pool if it can be shown in operating principals that their existing property rights will not be injured with the establishment of the pool.

It appears as though the recreational interests desire for a permanent pool has clouded any sense of obligation concerning other's existing property rights. They cry long and loud that the pool will not harm the irrigators but will make no effort to formulate the necessary rules to insure that harm will not be done to their fellow citizens.

I admire you for your continued resistance to rough-shod tactics which attempt to ignore or evade the laws which established freedom for all in our country.

Sincerely,

WAYNE W. WHITTAKER.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
August 9, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: Thank you for your letter of July 29 together with a copy of your letter to Mr. Felix L. Sparks, director of the Colorado Water Commission Board. I agree with the contents of your letter and think it is excellent.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL T. TUTT.

LAMAR, COLO.,
August 10, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: My apologies for not having replied any sooner but I was out of town and did not return until just a couple of days ago.

In reference to your letter concerning the permanent pool at John Martin, I sincerely believe after talking to farmers during the past few weeks both before and after the June floods that the water rights which the farmers are now receiving full benefits from should remain the same. The farmers as a whole feel that they will not receive full benefits from the dam if a permanent pool is put into effect and furthermore it would be a detriment to them.

However, most farmers on the ditches are willing and would like the opportunity to express their views and possibly work out a solution whereby a permanent pool could be retained. At this time a great many of the farmers have become very unhappy with the statements of FRANK EVANS and are unwilling to cooperate so long as they receive no recognition. The feelings as I wrote you several weeks ago is that the game and fish department, FRANK EVANS and Felix L. Sparks are no longer concerned with the farmers problems, or the potential loss to them.

At the same time the businessman, the rancher, and the laborer and those who do not depend on the ditches believe that they are entitled to the permanent pool and they are being cheated not only of their recreation but of potential tourist trade which might exist once a permanent pool was established.

My personal belief is that the problem can be solved and both segments of the community can be satisfied if the problems are openly expressed and resolved.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. BRADBURN.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

PROPOSED SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that I cannot support H.R. 11135, the proposed Sugar Act Amendments of 1965.

There is no question that this bill is a great improvement over the version approved earlier by the other body. Credit for this goes to the Senate Committee on Finance, which has removed several of the most outrageous and obnoxious features of the House-approved bill, especially with respect to the assignment of foreign sugar quotas.

But even so, too many basic inequities remain in the bill for me to support it. For several years, I have been uneasy about our basic policy in sugar, that has made it the most tightly controlled and heavily subsidized commodity in the country.

H.R. 11135 would continue this unhappy situation for an additional 2 to 5 years.

My fundamental objection to this legislation—and the program it perpetuates—is that it is horribly unfair to the American consumer. The American housewife is forced to pay twice under this program.

First. Her own tax dollars are being used to pay a huge subsidy to foreign producers of sugar—a subsidy of more than $70 a ton.

Second. These subsidies that she is forced to pay, act to drive up the price she must pay for sugar at the grocery store.

As of yesterday, October 18, the price of sugar was 15.5 cents a pound in the local chain stores and 18.5 cents a pound in the independent stores.

This does not make sense to me.

Under this legislation, the American taxpayers will be paying out more than $280 million a year in sugar subsidies to foreign producers.

It seems to me that it would make a great deal more sense if we were to cut back the subsidy and use at least part of this huge amount to develop an adequate sugar substitute that eventually would make us independent of the world sugar market.

At the very least, we could expend our domestic production to lessen our present dependence on foreign sugar producers which now supply about 40 percent of our total consumption.

A second basic objection to this bill is that there is no need for us to act at this time—in haste and without careful consideration.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I firmly favor approval of H.R. 11135, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965.

Although there are some features of this bill on which I have reservations, I believe the quota provisions to be generally fair to both domestic and foreign producers.

Further, as a Senator from a major sugar-producing State, I consider it essential that the Congress enact Sugar Act extensions this year.

Because I believe this to be necessary, I introduced on August 18, a bill, S. 2430, which contained provisions similar to those in the legislation now before us.

Last year, the domestic sugar-producing and refining industry was divided on the question of what amendments to the Sugar Act should be passed. In contrast, there is now complete unanimity of opinion in the domestic sugar industry in support of this bill. Uniting the industry was a difficult assignment. The interests of various segments of the industry diverge on many points. There is intense competition between them. It was only after weeks of conferences that the legislative recommendations were hammered out which are represented in this bill.

Upon introducing S. 2430, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of organizations representing the U.S. sugarbeet industry, the mainland sugar cane industry, the Hawaiian sugar cane industry, the Puerto Rican sugar cane industry, and the U.S. cane sugar refining industry. That list contains 70 names of companies and associations.

Over the years, the objectives of the U.S. sugar program have been achieved. These objectives include: the production in the United States of a substantial portion of the requirements of our market; and the assurance of a reliable supply of the balance of those requirements from the production of friendly foreign nations. This program has given us an adequate supply of sugar and stability of price.

The rise of Castro, however, disrupted U.S. relations with the nation from which we had obtained some half of our imports of sugar. The international sugar market was thrown into a state of near chaos.

With a shortage looming, American growers were encouraged to produce all the sugarbeets they could plant. This effort produced such volume that a surplus resulted. Further, the United States entered the world market to seek some 15 percent of our requirements.

Our buying in the world sugar market was accompanied by a rapid rise in prices. American consumers were forced to pay prices for sugar which had not been in effect since the 1920's.

We wound ourselves in the midst of the only really unstable sugar market to which we have been subjected since the sugar program was initiated.

This bill returns to the principle of assigning the entire quantity to be imported—including the withheld Cuban quota—to specific foreign countries. The bill will allow the rapid liquidation of any remaining surpluses of beet and mainland cane sugar; it will make unnecessary excessive acreage cutbacks in sugar producing areas; and it will allow refiners to adjust gradually to import volume.

Best of all, it will guard the stability of the U.S. sugar market, and the U.S. sugar industry, for a period of 5 years.

There are two questions which have had the spotlight of publicity played on them during consideration of this legislation. Both are discussed in the report of the House Committee on Agriculture on H.R. 11135, and the minority views attached thereto.

The first of these is the so-called import tax which it is said the administration was prepared to propose. The purpose of such a tax is to recapture some of the profit which foreign sugar producers enjoy by selling at the U.S. market price rather than at the world market price.

The question of a world market price is, of course, a complex one. Most sugar is produced for consumption in the country of origin or for export to known customers. Only a minor portion of world production is sold on what could be called a world market. The United States could never depend on any present world market to obtain all of the sugar we need, in addition to that produced domestically.

This year, the import tax has been rejected, principally on the theory that it is our policy to assist other Nations, especially those friendly to us in this hemisphere, through trade as well as aid.

The second question concerns lobbyists. It has been charged that excessive fees are being paid to some who are able to obtain unreasonably large sugar quotas for favored nations. It is also charged that lobbying tends to bring into production too many foreign sources.

As I have already said, the quotas in this bill appear to me to be generally fair.

But we should not forget that our objectives are to provide stability in the sugar market and prices that are reasonable for American consumers. If the prices that we are paying for foreign sugar are too far above the prices foreign producers may obtain elsewhere, it may well be that we are encouraging excess foreign production and a proliferation of foreign-producing nations at the same time that we are overcharging American consumers and taxpayers.

I believe both of these questions—sugar lobbying and the so-called import tax—should be given further consideration in the near future by Congress and by the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Finance. But these matters should not delay passage of this bill at this late stage of our deliberations. The bill is needed now, to forestall rapid price fluctuations and assure stability to the industry.

Almost 40,000 domestic farms grow sugarcane or sugarbeets. Some 235,000 farmworkers—mostly on a seasonal basis—are required to cultivate and harvest these sugar crops.

The farm investment in sugar crops in all domestic areas was estimated in 1959 to be $750 million. It has increased considerably since then.

In 1964, 63 beet sugar factories, 110 cane sugar mills, and 28 refineries were in operation in our domestic areas. The housewife, the commercial sugar user, the domestic sugar grower, and the foreign nations friendly to us who are favored with quotas, will benefit by enactment of this legislation this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate Finance Committee has been successful in coming to an agreement on the difficult, complex, and controversial legislation governing our domestic sugar production and supply. I support the amendments approved by the Finance Committee, for I find this legislation to be far superior to that which earlier passed the House of Representatives. I express every hope that the provisions of the Senate version will prevail.

I express the further hope that the Senate-House conference can be quickly convened and that the differences between the Senate and House versions can be resolved expeditiously. I represent in part the State which produces the most cane sugar in the continental United States. The Sugar Act Amendments of 1965 are sorely needed to protect not only our growers and processors but also our household consumers, our industrial users, our refiners, and many other groups. No one knows better than I that the sugar marketing quota increases provided in both the House and Senate versions of the bill are greatly needed and long overdue for both our mainland cane and beet sugar areas. There is no longer any contention over this. The increases for our domestic producers were proposed by the executive branch and agreed to by the House of Representatives, and all segments of our domestic industry support them.

The section of the pending measure now before us dealing with quota increases and approved by our Finance Committee and the House of Representatives is very commendable. But the Finance Committee's action in disapproving other provisions in the House-passed bill is also very commendable. I refer specifically to those provisions in the House bill which have to do with congressional distribution of the cane sugar quota and acreage among both processors and farmers. I do not believe the inclusion of these provisions by the House represents either wise or desirable legislation and I would like to take a few minutes here to outline my opposition to these sections of the House bill and my reasons therefor.

The House bill would amend the Sugar Act to authorize the establishment of a 25,000-ton marketing allotment reserve and a complementary acreage reserve for the mainland cane area, purportedly to take care of hardships and inequities. Such reserves are not needed and are not desirable.

The Sugar Act now provides for legitimate hardship cases and requires the Secretary of Agriculture, after public hearings at which all pertinent facts may be presented, to make a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of the mainland cane area's quota among the processors of the area and the area's acreage among the growers. The language in the House bill pertaining to the reserves singles out certain corporations for preferred treatment and would actually prevent the Secretary from attaining fairness, efficiency, and equity in the distribution of the area's quota and acreage.

It would be a mistake for Congress to adopt the practice of legislating sugar marketing allotments and acreages to individuals. The determination of individual allotments and acreages should be the result of careful and adequate investigation and public hearings. The Sugar Act now assigns that responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture. This has proven to be wise.

The House bill would further amend the Sugar Act to provide that the first 25,000-ton increase above the 1,100,000-ton mainland cane area quota shall be assigned to a new cane-processing facility. This is unfair in view of the fact that the 1,100,000-ton quota will not allow established cane processors to market as much sugar as they produced in 1963 or 1964 or their estimated production for 1965. Any small increase which may accrue to the 1,100,000-ton mainland cane area quota during the period of the proposed extension of the act should go to established processors. The size of the quota proposed for the mainland cane area is not large enough to create a need for new processing facilities.

In closing, let me say as I have said many times before, the sugar program is one of our most successful farm programs. Many groups benefit from this program. They include the domestic producers and processors of sugarcane and sugarbeets, the cane sugar refiners in the continental United States, the housewives, and the industrial sugar users.

The sugar program is financed by a tax on sugar, and tax collections since 1938 have exceeded expenditures by more than $500 million. I wish we could make such a statement about all farm programs.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe the leadership wishes to go back into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. Bress, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so move?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I so move.

Is that agreeable to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been so ordered.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 21, 1965
For actions of Oct. 20, 1965
89th-1st; No. 196

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriations.....1
Air pollution.....41
Appropriations.....1,40,42
Area development.....8
Budgeting.....5
CCC.....11
Commodity exchanges.....21
Cost of living.....33
Disaster relief.....12,14
Economic inequities.....28
Education.....3,18,35
Electrification.....8
Employment.....32
Farm labor.....6
Flood control.....4,16
Foreign aid.....22,42
Forestry.....15
Freight cars.....10
Guam.....25
Highways.....34
Investigations.....9
Irrigation.....17
Lands.....17
Legal aid.....19
Legislative accomplishments.....26
Manpower.....43
Marketing orders.....2
Meat inspection.....20,31
National parks.....38
Patents.....37
Personnel.....32,33,39,43
Reorganization.....27
Rivers and harbors.....4
Soil conservation.....24
Sugar.....7,13
Supplemental appropriations.....11,12
Taxation.....36
Trade fairs.....29
Transportation.....10
Water.....16,30
Watersheds.....23
Work week.....39
Yearbook.....40

HIGHLIGHTS: For highlights see page 5

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 8370, and acted on amendments in disagreement. Attached is a table showing the changes agreed upon. pp. 26742-7

2. MARKETING ORDERS. Concurred in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 2092, to permit marketing orders for certain fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 26706

3. EDUCATION. By a vote of 313 to 63, agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9567, the aid to higher education bill. pp. 26706-30

4. RIVERS-HARBORS AND FLOOD-CONTROL BILL. By a vote of 221 to 139, agreed to the conference report on this bill, S. 2300. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 26730-41

5. BUDGETING. Rep. Halpern spoke in favor of a Joint Committee on the Budget. p. 26762

6. FARM LABOR. Several Representatives debated the termination of the Mexican farm labor program. pp. 26763-80

7. SUGAR. Rep. Hansen, Iowa, inserted his press release defending the House sugar bill. p. 26790

8. ELECTRIFICATION; AREA DEVELOPMENT. Rep. Dent inserted a statement by Pres. Drumm of West Penn Power Co. upon receiving the "E" Service Award from Secretary Connor for area development activity. pp. 26793-4

9. INVESTIGATIONS. The Rules Committee reported with amendment H. Res. 605, authorizing the Agriculture Committee to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction (H. Rept. 1180). p. 26808

10. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment S. 1098, to insure adequacy of the railroad freight car supply (H. Rept. 1183). p. 26808

11. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President a 1966 supplemental request for $500 million for the Commodity Credit Corporation (H. Doc. 307). This item was considered as a part of the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1966, rather than in the Supplemental Appropriation Bill. p. 26807

SENATE

12. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed with amendments this bill, H.R. 11588 (pp. 26584, 26587-631). No changes were made in appropriations to this Department. (For a listing of the items see Digest 195) As passed the bill also provides $70 million to the President to carry out the Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965. House and Senate conferees were appointed on the bill (pp. 26781, 26630).

13. SUGAR. Passed, 69-16, with amendments H.R. 11135, the sugar bill. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Morse to add quotas of 422 short tons each for Honduras and Bolivia, and a technical corrective amendment by Sen. Long, La. Rejected various amendments. Senate and House conferees were appointed. pp. 26560-83, 26730

14. DISASTER RELIEF. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H.R. 11539, to provide assistance to Fla., La., and Miss. for reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane (S. Rep. 917). p. 26542

15. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 797, to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, Calif., (S. Rept. 922). p. 26542

16. WATER. The Agriculture Committee reported an original bill, S. 2679, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (S. Rept. 921) (p. 26542). The "Daily Digest" states that this bill is in respect to "maximum flood detention capacity of watershed project structures" (p. D1041).

ministration. There is very little evidence that the idea was thoroughly studied, carefully considered, and recommended to Congress in a manner which indicated the administration was prepared to administer the program effectively.

This has been a problem with a great deal of legislation this year. We have received recommendations from the executive branch but not the detailed proposals for the proper administration of the program which would give the Congress confidence in the readiness and ability of the administration to do the job. The majority leader of the Senate recently complained that Congress will have to spend much of its second session repairing the omissions and deficiencies of the legislation we passed this year. I see no reason to compound the problem.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. QUIE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. QUIE, of Minnesota, moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9567) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon the deletion of part B of title V of the bill, which would authorize the establishment of a National Teacher Corps.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 226, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

YEAS—152

Abbitt	Clancy	Griffin
Abernethy	Clawson, Del	Gross
Adair	Cleveland	Grover
Anderson, Ill.	Collier	Gubser
Andrews, Glenn	Colmer	Gurney
Arends	Conable	Haley
Ashbrook	Corbett	Hall
Ashmore	Cramer	Halleck
Ayres	Cunningham	Hansen, Idaho
Baldwin	Curtin	Hardy
Bates	Curtis	Harsha
Battin	Dague	Harvey, Ind.
Belcher	de la Garza	Harvey, Mich.
Betts	Derwinski	Henderson
Bolton	Devine	Herlong
Bow	Dickinson	Horton
Bray	Dole	Hull
Brock	Dowdy	Hutchinson
Broomfield	Downing	Jarman
Broyhill, N.C.	Duncan, Tenn.	Johnson, Pa.
Broyhill, Va.	Dwyer	Jonas
Buchanan	Ellsworth	Jones, Mo.
Burleson	Erlenborn	Keith
Burton, Utah	Findley	King, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Fisher	Kornegay
Cabell	Ford, Gerald R.	Kunkel
Cahill	Fountain	Laird
Casey	Fulton, Pa.	Langen
Cederberg	Gathings	Latta
Chamberlain	Gettys	Lipscomb
	Goodell	Long, La.
McClory	Pool	Springer
McCulloch	Quie	Stafford
McEwen	Quillen	Stanton
McMillan	Reid, Ill.	Taylor
MacGregor	Reinecke	Teague, Calif.
Mahon	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thomson, Wis.
Mailliard	Roberts	Tuck
Marsh	Rogers, Fla.	Utt
Martin, Ala.	Rogers, Tex.	Waggonner
Mathias	Rumsfeld	Walker, Miss.
Michel	Satterfield	Watson
Minshall	Saylor	Whalley
Mize	Schneebeli	White, Tex.
Moore	Schweiker	Whitener
Morton	Shriver	Whitten
Nelsen	Sikes	Widnall
Passman	Skubitz	Williams
Pelly	Smith, Calif.	Wyatt
Pirnie	Smith, N.Y.	Wydler
Poff	Smith, Va.	Younger

NAYS—226

Adams	Gray	Olsen, Mont.
Addabbo	Green, Oreg.	Olson, Minn.
Albert	Green, Pa.	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson, Tenn.	Greigg	Ottinger
Annunzio	Grider	Patman
Ashley	Griffiths	Patten
Bandstra	Hagen, Calif.	Pepper
Barrett	Halpern	Perkins
Beckworth	Hamilton	Philbin
Bennett	Hanley	Pickle
Bingham	Hanna	Pike
Blatnik	Hansen, Iowa	Powell
Boggs	Hansen, Wash.	Price
Boland	Harris	Pucinski
Bonner	Hathaway	Purcell
Brademas	Hawkins	Race
Brooks	Hays	Randall
Brown, Calif.	Hechler	Redlin
Burke	Helstoski	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Hicks	Resnick
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	Reuss
Callan	Holland	Rhodes, Pa.
Cameron	Howard	Rivers, Alaska
Carey	Hungate	Rodino
Carter	Huot	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Ichord	Ronan
Chelf	Irwin	Roncalio
Clark	Jacobs	Rooney, N.Y.
Clevenger	Jennings	Rooney, Pa.
Cohelan	Joelson	Rosenthal
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Johnson, Okla.	Roush
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Roybal
Corman	Karsten	Ryan
Craley	Karth	St Germain
Daddario	Kastenmeier	St. Onge
Daniels	Kee	Scheuer
Davis, Ga.	Kelly	Schisler
Dawson	King, Calif.	Schmidhauser
Delaney	King, Utah	Scott
Dent	Kluczynski	Secrest
Denton	Krebs	Selden
Donohue	Landrum	Senner
Dow	Long, Md.	Shipley
Dulski	Love	Sickles
Duncan, Oreg.	McCarthy	Slack
Dyal	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Edmondson	McDowell	Stalbaum
Edwards, Calif.	McFall	Steed
Edwards, La.	McGrath	Stephens
Evans, Colo.	McVicker	Stratton
Everett	Macdonald	Stubblefield
Evins, Tenn.	Machen	Sweeney
Fallon	Mackie	Teague, Tex.
Farbstein	Madden	Todd
Farnsley	Matsunaga	Trimble
Farnum	Meeds	Tupper
Fascell	Miller	Tuten
Feighan	Mills	Udall
Fino	Minish	Ullman
Flood	Mink	Van Deerlin
Fogarty	Moeller	Vanik
Foley	Monagan	Vigorito
Ford, William D.	Moorhead	Vivian
Fraser	Morris	Watts
Friedel	Morrison	Weltner
Fulton, Tenn.	Moss	White, Idaho
Gallagher	Multer	Willis
Garmatz	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Charles H.
Giaimo	Murphy, N.Y.	Wolff
Gibbons	Murray	Wright
Gilbert	Natcher	Yates
Gilligan	Nedzi	Young
Gonzalez	Nix	Zablocki
Grabowski	O'Brien	
	O'Hara, Ill.	
	O'Hara, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—54

Andrews, George W.	Aspinall	Bolling
Andrews, N. Dak.	Baring	Callaway
	Bell	Clausen, Don H.
	Berry	Culver
	Davis, Wis.	Lennon
	Diggs	Lindsay
	Dingell	Mackay
	Dorn	Martin, Mass.
	Edwards, Ala.	Martin, Nebr.
	Flynt	Matthews
	Frelinghuysen	May
	Fuqua	Morgan
	Hagan, Ga.	Morse
	Hébert	Mosher
	Hosmer	O'Konski
	Keogh	O'Neal, Ga.
	Kirwan	Poage
	Leggett	Reifel
		Rivers, S.C.
		Robison
		Roudebush
		Sisk
		Staggers
		Sullivan
		Talcott
		Tenzer
		Thomas
		Thompson, N.J.
		Thompson, Tex
		Toll
		Tunney
		Walker, N. Mex.
		Watkins
		Wilson, Bob

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hagan of Georgia for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Tenzer against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Culver against.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. Mackay against.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Walker of New Mexico against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. JONES of Missouri changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 313, nays 63, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—313

Abbitt	Beckworth	Burke
Adair	Bennett	Burton, Calif.
Adams	Betts	Burton, Utah
Addabbo	Bingham	Byrne, Pa.
Albert	Blatnik	Cabell
Anderson, Ill.	Boggs	Cahill
Anderson, Tenn.	Boland	Callan
Annunzio	Bolton	Cameron
Arends	Bonner	Carey
Ashley	Bow	Carter
Ayres	Brademas	Casey
Baldwin	Bray	Cederberg
Bandstra	Brock	Celler
Barrett	Brooks	Chamberlain
Bates	Broomfield	Chelf
Battin	Brown, Calif.	Clark
	Broyhill, Va.	Cleveland

Clevenger	Holifield	Pirnie
Cohelan	Holland	Powell
Conable	Horton	Price
Corbett	Howard	Pucinski
Conyers	Hull	Purcell
Cooley	Hungate	Race
Corbett	Huot	Randall
Corman	Ichord	Redlin
Craley	Irwin	Reid, N.Y.
Cramer	Jacobs	Reinecke
Cunningham	Jarman	Resnick
Curtis	Jennings	Reuss
Daddario	Joelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Daniels	Johnson, Calif.	Rivers, Alaska
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Okla.	Roberts
Dawson	Johnson, Pa.	Rodino
de la Garza	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Delaney	Karsten	Rogers, Fla.
Dent	Karth	Ronan
Denton	Kastenmeier	Roncalio
Donohue	Kee	Rooney, N.Y.
Dow	Keith	Rooney, Pa.
Dowdy	Kelly	Rosenthal
Downing	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Dulski	King, N.Y.	Roush
Duncan, Oreg.	King, Utah	Roybal
Duncan, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Rumsfeld
Dwyer	Kornegay	Ryan
Dyal	Krebs	St Germain
Edmondson	Kunkel	St. Onge
Edwards, Calif.	Landrum	Scheuer
Edwards, La.	Langen	Schisler
Ellsworth	Latta	Schmidhauser
Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.	Schneebeli
Everett	Love	Schweiker
Evins, Tenn.	McCarthy	Scott
Fallon	McCulloch	Secrest
Farbstein	McDade	Selden
Farnsley	McDowell	Senner
Farnum	McEwen	Shipley
Fascell	McFall	Shriver
Feighan	McGrath	Sickles
Fino	McVicker	Sikes
Flood	Macdonald	Skubitz
Fogarty	Machen	Slack
Foley	Mackie	Smith, Iowa
Ford, Gerald R.	Madden	Smith, N.Y.
Ford, William D.	Mahon	Smith, Va.
	Mailliard	Springer
Fraser	Marsh	Stafford
Friedel	Mathias	Stalbaum
Fulton, Pa.	Matsunaga	Stanton
Fulton, Tenn.	Meeds	Steed
Gallagher	Miller	Stephens
Garmatz	Mills	Stratton
Giaimo	Minish	Stubblefield
Gibbons	Mink	Sweeney
Gilbert	Minshall	Taylor
Gilligan	Mize	Teague, Calif.
Gonzalez	Moeller	Teague, Tex.
Grabowski	Monagan	Thomson, Wis.
Gray	Moore	Todd
Green, Oreg.	Moorhead	Trimble
Green, Pa.	Morris	Tupper
Greigg	Morrison	Tuten
Grider	Morton	Udall
Griffiths	Moss	Ullman
Grover	Multer	Van Deerlin
Gubser	Murphy, Ill.	Vanik
Hagen, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.	Vigorito
Halleck	Murray	Vivian
Halpern	Natcher	Watts
Hamilton	Nedzi	Weltner
Hanley	Nix	Whalley
Hanna	O'Brien	White, Idaho
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara, Ill.	White, Tex.
Hansen, Iowa	O'Hara, Mich.	Widnall
Hansen, Wash.	Olsen, Mont.	Willis
Hardy	Olson, Minn.	Wilson, Charles H.
Harris	O'Neill, Mass.	
Harvey, Ind.	Ottinger	Wolff
Harvey, Mich.	Patman	Wright
Hathaway	Patten	Wyatt
Hawkins	Pelly	Wydler
Hays	Pepper	Yates
Hechler	Perkins	Young
Helstoski	Philbin	Zablocki
Herlong	Pickle	
Hicks	Pike	

NAYS—63

Abernethy	Colmer	Goodell
Andrews, Glenn	Curtin	Griffin
	Dague	Gross
Ashbrook	Derwinski	Gurney
Ashmore	Devine	Haley
Belcher	Dickinson	Hall
Broyhill, N.C.	Dole	Henderson
Buchanan	Erlenborn	Hutchinson
Burleson	Findley	Jones, Mo.
Byrnes, Wis.	Fisher	Laird
Clancy	Fountain	Lipscomb
Clawson, Del	Gathings	Long, La.
Collier	Gettys	McClory
McMillan	Quillen	Waggonner
MacGregor	Reid, Ill.	Walker, Miss.
Martin, Ala.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Watson
Michel	Rogers, Tex.	Whitener
Nelsen	Satterfield	Whitten
Passman	Saylor	Williams
Poff	Smith, Calif.	Younger
Pool	Tuck	
Quie	Utt	

NOT VOTING—57

Andrews, George W.	Fuqua	O'Neal, Ga.
	Hagan, Ga.	Poage
Andrews, N. Dak.	Harsha	Reifel
	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Aspinall	Hosmer	Robison
Baring	Jonas	Roudebush
Bell	Keogh	Sisk
Berry	Kirwan	Staggers
Bolling	Leggett	Sullivan
Callaway	Lennon	Talcott
Clausen, Don H.	Lindsay	Tenzer
	Mackay	Thomas
Culver	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Wis.	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Diggs	Matthews	Toll
Dingell	May	Tunney
Dorn	Morgan	Walker, N. Mex.
Edwards, Ala.	Morse	Watkins
Flynt	Mosher	Wilson, Bob
Frelinghuysen	O'Konski	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Matthews against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Robison for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Berry.

Messrs. TUCK and McCLORY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11135) entitled "An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE SUGAR BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11135) with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, ABERNETHY, PURCELL, MORRISON, MATSUNAGA, DAGUE, BELCHER, and TEAGUE of California.

RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT OF 1965

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 18, 1965.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the conference report on the bill S. 2300. The work on this bill began back last January when the Members of the House started to introduce bills for projects in their districts, and reports from the Corps of Engineers began to accumulate. It was necessary to have reports from the different agencies in order for us to be able to make a comprehensive study of each project. I do not think there was a day when I came on the floor that a Member did not say something to me in regard to a project he had before our committee.

Hearings were held by the subcommittee chairman of the rivers and harbors [Mr. BLATNIK] and chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control [Mr. JONES]. These gentlemen held 6 weeks of hearings, at which time they considered every project that was before our committee.

Only those projects were included which had a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio and which in our judgment would further the economy of this country. In many instances, of course, these projects involve flood control to protect the

lives and property of our citizens all over these United States.

The full committee met on a number of occasions to consider and mark up the reports of the subcommittees. On some of the projects contained in this bill, I differed with the committee's report and voted against them in committee. But when the bill was marked up and finalized, I supported the judgment of the full committee and supported the bill on the final vote in committee and certainly supported it on the floor of the House when it was brought to us for the consideration of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Committee on Public Works since the reorganization of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and Roads Committee and the formation of the Committee on Public Works. In all of that time I have never had a project in my district. Not because the committee would not listen or consider a project, if I had one, but because we did not need the type of projects that are considered in the omnibus rivers and harbors bills.

In my time spent here in the House of Representatives as a member of this committee, I have visited almost every State in the Union where we were asked to consider a public works project.

We visited those States and those areas because we wanted to have a better understanding of the needs of the particular district and the States so that we could come back to the House with the information so that the proper consideration could be given to these requests on the basis of the needs of the State and of the people. Of course, there were many times when I was not able to go but the subcommittee chairmen took the committees into the States where projects were being inspected. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, has visited every State that has suffered a catastrophe whether it was the result of a flood or hurricane so that he could bring back that firsthand knowledge and understanding that is so necessary for us to legislate properly.

Mr. Speaker, I think the committee did a good job when it brought the bill here to the House at first. When the bill went to conference, they did the best job that could be done under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I realize we have before us today an issue that is extremely difficult. Practically every Member of this House, as I am, is concerned as to what, on the merits, should be done. So far as I am concerned, the action taken leaves, in my opinion, if the proper rights of the House and the prerogatives of this great coequal legislative body, coequal with the Senate, if we are to sustain our rights as conferees and as a coequal body, little alternative but to vote down the conference report. It is my understanding and as you will see by the RECORD of yesterday at page 26442 that it will be in order, and I have no reason to believe such a motion would not be made, because there are many projects in this, some $2 billion worth, of which $1,700 million is relatively noncontroversial that has been approved by the conference. I support those projects. I do not support, however, the Dickey-Lincoln project. It is not a small project, for it involves $300 million—$233 million is the Federal cost and $73 million is the estimated transmission cost if it is a Federal project.

The merits of the Dickey-Lincoln School project have been discussed in previous debate. The House sustained the position of those in opposition to the Dickey-Lincoln project by a substantial vote of 207 to 185. The merits of Dickey-Lincoln remain exactly the same as they were at the time the House voted a few weeks ago on that specific project. Now we are in a parliamentary procedure position that if, in fact, we want again to assert the House position in opposition to this project, this 98-percent power—and very little other benefits other than that resulting from area redevelopment—we have no alternative but to vote down the conference report. I have reason to believe a motion would initially be made, and which is in order—and this was confirmed on my inquiry of the Speaker yesterday—to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions that the previous House position on Dickey-Lincoln be sustained.

What was the position of the House on Dickey-Lincoln? It was very reasonable. On the Clark motion, which was adopted, we said that there should be a thorough study of the Dickey-Lincoln project. There was adequate money put into the measure for such a study. We committed ourselves as members of the committee to consider the matter in the Committee of the House soon, where the facts could be developed. There has never been a separate study relating to this Dickey-Lincoln phase of the Passamaquoddy project, so we are not talking about a small project. We are talking about $300 million. We are not talking about an insignificant issue, at least in my opinion. We are talking about a critical issue.

I repeat. The facts have not changed relating to Dickey-Lincoln. I wish to make sure that all the facts are brought before the Members. We had a letter submitted in conference by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], who is very much interested in the project, for it would be in his State. Although the people who would use the power are a long way off, the project would be in his State. The fact is that he submitted the Federal Power Commission letter which was written to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative O'NEILL, to the effect that it appeared, after very brief consideration by the Federal Power Commission, that perhaps the cost of the power would be greater than that previously estimated if the private power people did it, compared with a public power project. But in analyzing the basis of those facts, they just do not hold up.

For example, consider the Federal interest cost of 3.8 or 3⅛ percent. The cost would actually be, as we all know, 4¼ percent, which is the cost of Federal money.

They did not consider taxes which would be foregone which private enterprise would pay. They included a total of $73 million for transmission lines which would be necessary if the project is a Federal project, but would not be necessary if it is a private matter. If it is private, it would be $3.8 million. So obviously they weighted the matter and tried to bring in different figures. But they did not ask the opinion of the Atomic Energy Commission, which states that, with the use of that power, you can do it at about one-fifth of the cost. As far as I am concerned, the facts are the same now as they were when the issue was considered before.

So we get to the parliamentary situation. What is the issue there? As I see it, the issue there is whether we in this body should accept the procedure that is being forced upon us by the other body, which is to take it or leave it, a blackjack approach of the other body. If we thus let them subvert the rules of this House, which are very clear, that the party asking for the conference, the other body has the right to act first on the conference report—and if that had been done, we would have had an opportunity to vote on a motion to recommit, for or against the Dickey-Lincoln School project a second time and so instruct the conferees—we will see that the other body is acting to prevent us from acting.

So if we are going to substitute, by accepting this conference report, for the rule that is on the books now, and which has generally been observed, a rule that might be termed the "If you kidnap the papers, you can keep these projects out," then Members will vote for the conference report. But if you are going to oppose such an approach, stand by the prerogatives of this House, and stand by the right of this body to have another vote on this project, then it is a very simple procedure. I think these issues are fundamental. The issue of Dickey-Lincoln is fundamental. But the issue of procedure is equally fundamental.

In conference a member of the conferees asked the chairman the question: "Is it not true that the other body, the Senate, having asked for this conference, we, the House, have a right to the papers and to act first?" The answer was "Yes" by the chairman of the conference, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. MCNAMARA.

I am not charging anyone with bad faith. I am charging them with knowing precisely what they were attempting to do and what they will accomplish if we let them. I object to it. I do not believe we should substitute a "kidnap the paper" rule for a good faith relationship between these two bodies now and in the future.

These are the basic issues involved. The Dickey-Lincoln project can be considered under the study amendment that

was adopted by the House, and it would be in order after the conference report is voted down, under instructions to the conferees. This project will get fair consideration, I am convinced, by the committee and by the House after adequate study has been had.

A question has been raised as to "What will happen to me, if I have a project in this bill? Will I or will I not have an opportunity to vote on this this year? Is my project going to be killed?"

I say to the Members, in all candor, I believe it is quite obvious that there are enough problems for enough Members involving enough projects so that it will be insisted on that the matter be returned to conference, not next year but this year. As soon as the conference report is voted down, in my opinion, a motion will be made, and the conferees will be able to immediately reconvene. Then the issue before the conferees will be Dickey-Lincoln.

The argument which I have heard in the Chamber and otherwise is, "Gee, I cannot vote against this report, or for the motion to recommit, because I have a project in it." I have a project in it, too—not a very big project, but I do have a project in it. That argument does not hold water. We are talking about a principle.

If the Members believe in these principles, if they are opposed to Dickey-Lincoln, as some 207 Members were, they will vote against the conference report.

This has been done before. Such an effort was made on the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. The issue then was not nearly as clear. The issue here is clear. Either we are for or against Dickey-Lincoln. If we are for it, we will vote for the conference report. If we are against it, we should vote against the conference report. That is the issue which basically is before us.

It is my hope that this House will vote down the conference report and will then immediately vote for a motion to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions that the study of Dickey-Lincoln be undertaken immediately, under the instructions of the Congress, as provided in the Clark amendment.

I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] had intended to offer a motion to recommit. I ask the distinguished gentleman whether that is correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. He is denied the opportunity to do so by this procedure, intentionally. There is not any question about the intention.

As I say, I am not charging anyone with bad faith, but I do say they intended to keep us from voting, when we had, under the rules, a right to vote. If we do not vote down the conference report they will succeed.

A new unofficial statement of the Federal Power Commission, dated October 5, 1965, which purports to be a "Comparative Analysis" of the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project is being circulated in Congress in an attempt to get the House to restore the authorization for the project in S. 2300, the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. The statement contains figures supposedly representing comparative costs of four alternatives: First, the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project; second, some theoretical steam plants in Massachusetts and Maine described in an FPC letter of February 16, 1965; third, a pumped storage-nuclear combination plan developed in an FPC staff study dated September 30, 1965; and, fourth, the New England utilities' plan. No supporting material is available showing how the FPC figures were derived. However, by reference to earlier very meager information contained in Interior's August 1964 report, the basic criteria used in their preparation is quite evident. They would represent for alternatives 2, 3, and 4 what FPC and the Government agencies consider power values or benefits—not costs of production. This is clear in the case of alternative 2 as shown in paragraph 2, page 4, of the Secretary of the Interior's July 9, 1965, report to the President on the "Conservation of the Natural Resources of New England—The Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project and Upper St. John River Hydroelectric Development," which states:

> Since the initiation of this study, in 1961, the utility industry has developed generating units of 500,000-kilowatts capacity which are now scheduled for installation in the Boston area, and a unit of 125,000-kilowatts capacity is being installed in Maine. New steam-electric plants in the Boston area are estimated to cost $125 per kilowatt and plants in Maine $140 per kilowatt. On the basis of these larger more economical developments which have taken place during the course of these studies, the Federal Power Commission on February 16, 1965, furnished revised power values for application in Maine and the Boston area. The revised at-market values were computed to be $22.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.3 mills per kilowatt-hour in the Boston area, and $24.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.9 mills per kilowatt-hour in Maine. A composite power value would be $23.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

These are the same figures appearing in the FPC October 5, 1965, statement for alternative No. 2 and were derived from the same factors used in the 1964 report but applied to more modern lower unit cost plants similar to those built by the electric companies in New England in recent years. These factors include allowances for taxes of all kinds and going market rates for cost of money. Obviously, FPC followed its traditional practice in using these same factors in estimating power values or benefits—not costs—for alternatives 3 and 4, but this is not the case with respect to the figures shown for the Dickey-Lincoln School project which are Federal production and transmission costs only. The Dickey-Lincoln School figures include no allowance for taxes and a 3⅛-percent rate of interest.

The factors used in arriving at annual costs and subsequently capacity and energy costs for alternatives, 2, 3, and 4, are 6.25 percent of the total investment costs for cost of money, 1.20 percent for depreciation and replacement, 5.72 percent for taxes, and 2 percent for operation and maintenance. Corresponding factors used in the case of Dickey-Lincoln School are 3.125 percent for cost of money, 0.86 percent for amortization, or depreciation, and replacements, nothing for taxes, and 0.45 percent for operation, maintenance, and insurance. In other words there is a 5.72-percent tax charge and a 3.125-percent additional interest charge for alternatives Nos. 2, 3, and 4 not applied to alternative No. 1. Obviously, the figures for alternatives 2, 3, and 4 cannot be compared to the figures for Dickey-Lincoln School project because they are not comparable things. The figures for alternatives 2, 3, and 4 also do not conform to the instructions contained in Senate Document No. 97, the Federal agencies' bible. For an interpretation of its requirements we can go to no less an authority than the Corps of Engineers. In its reply to certain questions propounded by Senator COOPER with respect to the Devils Jumps project, the Corps of Engineers stated:

> The comparability test which the Corps employs is designed specifically to show the relative economic efficiency of the project and available alternatives. In making this test for the power purpose the cost of producing equivalent power by the most likely alternative new power source is determined using the same method of financing (same interest rate, tax assumptions, etc.) as for the Federal project.

This reference is found on page 296 of the Senate hearings on S. 2300, dated April 21, 1965. Note that the Corps of Engineers says that the comparability test is designed to show the "relative efficiency" of the project and alternatives, and that for the power purpose the cost of producing equivalent power is determined by using the same interest rate, tax assumptions, et cetera, as used for the Federal project. This is the only way any meaningful conclusions can be drawn. The comparison must compare comparable things. This, the FPC statement of October 5, 1965 has not done.

Now for the specifics. The FPC statement claims that the New England utilities analyses omit transmission costs and losses, and project operation and maintenance expense, and that they do not "reveal the period used comparable to the payout period for the Dickey-Lincoln School project." The information on transmission costs and losses, and operation and maintenance expense, is contained in the material submitted by the companies to the House Public Works Committee. These figures are included in the estimates of the electric companies. Furthermore, if FPC staff had taken the time to read the record of the hearings of the House Committee on Public Works, it would have found on page 506 a table showing the true comparative costs of the New England utility companies' plan and the Dickey-Lincoln School project on a 50-year amortization basis, with and without taxes. It will be noted here, also, that the electric companies with full interest claim only a 30-percent tax load—1.3 mills more than the 4.3 mills for energy without taxes, or 5.6 mills with taxes.

In the case of alternatives 2, 3, and 4, taxes as computed by the FPC, represent some 40 percent of the total figure shown

in the FPC statement. Failure to include taxes does not remove the burden on the economy. The cost to the general economy exists whether or not as a matter of policy it is paid by the Federal Government. Moreover, it is not a cost of production to the entities involved in any non-Federal development, but a cost of carrying on a business. If the comparison is to measure the actual costs of the various alternatives, it must accordingly be computed on a comparable basis.

The comparability analysis also has nothing to do with the question of whether or not taxes should be charged on Government operations. That is a matter of pricing policy and not of cost comparisons.

Another large discrepancy in the FPC October 5, 1965, statement is the fact that in the case of the Federal project an artificial interest rate of only 3⅛ percent is used, whereas the actual cost of money to the United States is 4¼ percent and for the non-Federal alternatives an interest rate of 6.25 percent is used, or twice the rate used for the Federal project. These widely divergent factors were employed even though the Corps of Engineers correctly states that for the comparability test the same method of financing is essential.

While no brief is held for the New England electric companies' plan or cost estimates, it appears that, except for operation and maintenance and transmission, FPC accepts the companies' figures. In this connection a simple comparison of the percentage of investment costs used in the FPC statement for the two sets of alternatives might be enlightening:

	Federal Dickey-Lincoln School project	Non-Federal alternatives
Cost of money	$3.125	$6.25
Depreciation and replacement	.860	1.20
Taxes	----------	5.72
Operation, maintenance, and insurance	.450	2.00
Total	4.435	15.17

From the above it should be clear that even if greater allowances for transmission, operation, and maintenance were included, as proposed by the FPC, the cost, at least for alternatives 3 and 4, when corrected to provide for comparable taxes and interest, would still be far less than for the proposed Federal Dickey-Lincoln School project. This is the comparability test which the Corps of Engineers employs to show the relative efficiency of a project and its alternatives. It measures the cost of the economy of the various alternatives. Under such an analysis Dickey-Lincoln School is found wanting.

The short history of Dickey-Lincoln School is also very revealing. Under standard planning practice all possible alternatives are explored before a particular proposal is adopted. Among other things the alternative advanced by the New England electric companies had never been examined by the Government agencies. In fact, the first quickie study of something along these lines evidently came after the House Public Works Committee hearings in August 1965 on S. 2300. The FPC October 5, 1965, statement indicates that such a study was made on September 30, 1965. What more or better argument can be made as to the need for a real study of the Dickey-Lincoln School project? Furthermore, it is of interest to note that each time a new set of figures are supplied by the Federal agencies, the benefits from Dickey-Lincoln School go down and the costs of alternatives are reduced. As the planners become more familiar with the situation, Dickey-Lincoln School becomes progressively less attractive. The August 1964 Interior report used a composite power value for alternative non-Federal generating plants of $27.50 kilowatt-year. In Interior's July 1965 report the figure was reduced to $23.50 kilowatt-year. In FPC's October 5, 1965, statement a pumped storage nuclear combination—alternative 3—showed a value of $20.40 kilowatt-year. The New England utilities' alternate plan was shown as $11.70 kilowatt-year. If this trend continues, it might be that the project may eventually be priced out of the market even by the Government planners.

With such a shady record, the House can do no other than provide the time for a real objective, unbiased study of the Dickey-Lincoln School project by the Corps of Engineers, the agency which would be responsible for its construction. Certainly, we cannot afford to embark on a $300-million-plus venture on the basis of existing data, particularly when we can in several months have the material we need to make a sound judgment. Opposition to such a short delay can only be suspect and be interpreted as a fear of exposure of the truth about the project. If Dickey-Lincoln School is as good as claimed by its proponents, nothing will be lost by the proposed study as directed by the House in September. If it cannot stand such close scrutiny, it should not be authorized in any event. A 5-month deferment will do no harm and is not an exorbitant price to pay for verification of the project's claimed merits, and assurance that it will fulfill its promises. The earlier House action should be sustained.

First. A statement has been made that Maine Public Service Co. was purchasing hydropower from the New Brunswick Power Commission at a very low cost—5 mills per kilowatt-hour—and was reselling it to company customers at nearly three times what the company paid for it.

Maine Public Service Co. serves an area in northern Maine.

It reports that the 5 mill power referred to is dump power, so called, which cannot be relied to meet system requirements and therefore has little value. In 1964 this company's purchases of "dump power" at 5 mills represented only three-tenths of 1 percent of its total system input. For the 8 months ended August 1965, such dump-power purchases represented only three one-hundredths of 1 percent of its total system input.

For "firm power" which can be relied to meet system loads and, therefore, has a higher value, Maine Public Service Co. paid the New Brunswick Power Commission an average price of 9.8 mills per kilowatt-hour in 1964 and 13.4 mills per kilowatt-hour for the first 8 months of 1965.

Second. A statement has been made that Central Maine Power Co., the largest electric utility in Maine, has announced rate reductions only twice in its history; first, when the Passamaquoddy-St. Johns report was published, and secondly, prior to recent congressional hearings.

This statement is extremely erroneous. In a decree dated July 23, 1948 the Maine Public Utilities Commission stated:

> It (Central Maine Power Co.) has had no general rate increase in over 30 years but had effected substantial reductions in rates during that time. In 1945 and 1946 residential rates were reduced $600,000, commercial $150,000 and street lighting $53,000, a total of $803,000.

In just the 10-year period preceding the commission's decree, Central Maine Power Co., in addition to the specific rate decreases, listed by the commission, made eight general and six special rate decreases totaling over $800,000 per year. So, over the entire period 1937 to 1946, this company made 16 rate decreases aggregating over $1,625,000 per year.

Over the last 2 years it has made rate decreases totaling over $1,630,000.

Third. A statement has been made that a Maine housewife wrote to her Senator that she did not get a rate reduction in the 1963 decrease made by Central Maine Power Co., and discovered in subsequent bills that her rates had gone up, rather than down, after the announced rate reduction.

The company's answer is that this customer was probably one of the few customers in a water heating group owning large—80 gallon—water heaters who did not get a rate decrease; but actually because of a change in rate form got a small increase. This was corrected in the 1965 rate decrease—the problem having been worked out in two steps over the 2-year period.

Fourth. It has been stated that although the Electric Coordinating Council of New England was formed in 1948, for the purpose of bringing cheaper power to the area, power rates had actually increased in the area 18.3 percent during that period while they had increased in the United States by only 4 percent.

This is not a fact. During that period the average cost to the consumer of each kilowatt-hour of electricity actually decreased by 10.4 percent in the United States and by 6.92 percent in New England.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Public Works comes now to the end of many, many months of long, arduous, and painstaking study on

many, many projects throughout the entire United States.

In an effort to serve the House we have done our very best to see that justice and fairness is performed in every instance.

I believe it is important to stress that the bill whose fate we are deciding by the vote which will next be held contains not one project but 142 projects. It is a bill which affects the citizens residing in the congressional districts of some 240 Members of this House. So it is not a question of whether we like one given project; it is a question of whether we want to hold up and delay the development of the water resources of the United States in 240 of the congressional districts, on 142 different projects—or whether we want to have a bill this year.

The suggestion has been implicit in some of the things that have been said that this is a question of upholding the prerogatives of the House. The implication is present that your conferees, serving you and the Members of the House, have failed to uphold those prerogatives of the House. I should like to point out to you that the chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], has never had a project in this bill nor has he ever asked for one.

I should like to stress to you further that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], served long and hard and arduously in this conference committee, gaining in 9 cases out of 10 the side of the House over the side of the Senate. He has no project in this bill for his area, and he undertook to do this grueling work at a time when he was suffering severe physical pain.

I should like to point out also that the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, had spent several weeks in the hospital at a crucial point in the session and came back in order to hold hearings on these projects in this bill.

These men effectively upheld the position of the House in the conference. The House receded in conference on only six items. The Senate receded in conference on 67 items. For each time that the House conferees receded the Senate conferees receded on 11 separate counts. I ask you, have we failed to uphold the prerogatives of the House?

Obviously we could not get everything we wanted. Obviously we could not insist that the House position prevail every time when there is another body to consider. Henry Clay said:

> Do not despise compromise, for it is the cement that holds the Union together.

Now, particularly in a matter of a conference committee, compromise is the name of the game. If both bodies went to the conference table absolutely unyielding and absolutely unwilling to give in on a single point, why, there would be no purpose in having a conference committee. There would be no possibility of having legislation.

So, ironically, we have some groups coming in here and saying we should vote down the entire bill, the entire conference committee report, because it contains one project that they do not approve of personally. On the other hand, there are Members here who have been gravely disappointed because it does not contain projects that they wanted and felt entitled to. The House did not yield easily on any of these points.

On the two points at issue on which we did yield, we debated with the Senate conferees for 1 hour on one of them and for 2 hours on the other one. On one of them we got assurances from the other conferees that a separate bill would be considered by their body next year to accommodate the position of the House. We have done as well as we could, and I think we have brought before you a good bill.

The question is clear. The question you will answer when you answer the roll is, do you want a bill this year or do you not want one. That is just what it amounts to. It is just that simple. Let nobody deceive you into thinking that we can go back into conference at this late date and resolve differences that we were not able to resolve in 2 long days of difficult conferences.

So you decide and you give the answer. You answer your constituents, your conscience, and your country. When your name is called on that roll, you will be answering this question: Do you want to delay the development of the natural water resources of this country by another year? Do you want to assume that responsibility at a time when we need more desperately than ever in our history to develop the water resources of our land? If you do not, then vote for the conference committee report.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

(Mr. CLARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we get inundated by all the verbs and adjectives of our orations. I would like to take a few minutes to draw a picture of what we are talking about on this Dickey-Lincoln project. The dams are located here on the St. John River, at the farthest end of Maine, over 400 miles away from the area in which the power would be used.

This huge land area encompasses nearly 700 square miles and is lightly populated, by less than 100,000 people. It could be roughly compared to the square-mile area of Connecticut and Rhode Island which have a combined population of 3,500,000.

The transmission problem involves some 400 miles to the major load centers at Boston, and so forth. Equivalent transmission spans would string across the country from Altoona, Pa., to Boston, or, for instance, from Buffalo to New York, or from Washington to Boston. There is a difference of over 400 miles.

I say to you when you are going to build a northern dam in the northern part of Maine where you are going to have a hydroelectric dam compared to what we already have in the Massachusetts-Connecticut-Rhode Island area of nuclear and thermo power, then I think you can see that in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in DAN FLOOD's district, which has all this coal that we need so badly to be used, this coal cannot be used, but it could be used if we had a thermo plant in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. It would be closer from Wilkes-Barre, Pa., to Boston, the load area, than it would be from the Maine Dickey-Lincoln project.

I say to you not only in the transmission lines where you have a $80 million project from Dickey-Lincoln down into the load center areas of New England, where we have 24 of the Congressmen representing the New England area who are against this Dickey-Lincoln project, is it fair for the House to stick a project down these gentlemen's throats in order to help the Dickey-Lincoln project 400 miles from Boston?

Another thing I would like to bring up is the fact that a year ago we had on the floor another power project and it was stated that we had no agreement with Canada. I say to you that the Interior Committee, and no other committee, is going to say whether the Dickey-Lincoln project should be approved or disapproved because of the treaty agreement.

There is a 95-percent power factor in this project. Five percent is in what they call flood control and recreation.

Now look at that area. In the Dickey-Lincoln area we have 360 people. So 360 people are going to get 5 percent of recreation and flood control. Now we look across the river into the Canadian side, and what do we have? We do one thing. We are going to be helping the Canadians on the recreation and flood control, and we are not going to be helping our Maine Dickey-Lincoln supporters for flood control in Maine.

So as a result, I ask you to vote down this conference report, and I am sure, although the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] said if this report were voted down there would not be a conference report, I say to you that I feel that there would be because, if you remember, the Trinity River project is in this bill.

So I ask you to vote down the conference report, and I am sure we will get another chance to vote on this bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

(Mr. BALDWIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report on S. 2300. This does not mean that I agree with all portions of this conference report, because I do not.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I continue to be opposed to the St. Johns River public power project in Maine. I did not believe that the evidence presented before our committee was sufficiently conclusive to warrant the commitment of $227 million of Federal funds for this public power project, particularly when we had testimony before our committee that private enterprise in that area was working rapidly toward the development of

nuclear powerplants to provide power and particularly because we had a letter submitted to us, and which is printed in the printed hearings, to the effect that the various public utilities in that area estimate that through the development of nuclear energy they can cut their cost and their rates by 40 percent over the next 15 years.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, it did not seem to me that we should commit the taxpayers to pay a $227 million commitment. I felt that the House of Representatives acted properly when it voted to eliminate this project and simply authorized a study of comparative costs of using other means of developing the power needed for the area.

However, Mr. Speaker, a conference is a matter of give and take. There were two major public power projects that had been authorized by the other body in their version of the bill that had not been authorized by the House in our version of the bill. One of them was the St. Johns project. The other was the Devils Jump project. The House conferees did succeed in upholding the position of the House as to the Devils Jump project, a $151 million project which had been authorized in the Senate bill. Therefore, that project does not appear in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, as a whole, the House conferees upheld the position of the House on a majority of the disputed items.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss one particular aspect of this bill which may present a problem between now and the time when the President makes his decision as to his action on the bill.

Some of the conferees have been informed by at least one or more of the legal advisers of some of the administrative agencies involved in this bill that they may recommend to the President that the President veto this bill because of section 201 of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, section 201 of the bill authorizes a simplified procedure for the clearance of projects under $10 million. Those projects today have to wait for an omnibus bill. This is the first omnibus bill which we have had for a period of 3 years and, therefore, some projects have waited for 3 years for an omnibus authorization bill.

Under section 201 if a project is less than $10 million in scope, from now on it can be authorized simply by the passage of a resolution by the House and Senate Public Works Committee. When such a resolution is passed by those two committees, the project becomes an authorized project and can be carried out by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, these legal advisers who have contacted some of our conferees from the administrative agencies involved have implied that they may recommend a veto because they feel that the constitutional powers of the executive branch may be jeopardized by this provision. I do not feel that is the case at all. As a matter of fact we have two similar procedures regularly being followed as a result of legislation enacted years ago by the Congress and signed by the President. One is in the case of soil conservation projects. Such projects regularly only come before the House and Senate Public Works Committees if they involve dams of a certain size and they only require resolutions to be passed by the two committees, and then they become authorized projects, no matter what the projected cost may be.

This is the result of legislation enacted by the Congress and signed by the President.

The second example is the Public Buildings Act passed by the Congress and signed by the President, which provides that a public building, no matter what its cost may be, $40 or $60 million, only needs to be authorized by a resolution passed by the House and Senate Public Works Committees, and once this resolution is passed by those two committees the building is authorized, and does not require any further legislative act by this Congress. So it is clear a precedent has been established in this field, and section 201 of the present bill is consistent with that precedent.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California on his statement on section 201 of this bill. That was carefully drawn as the result of the experience of the two public laws the gentleman referred to.

I would like to point out in addition to that that we have been faced with these reimbursement situations where a community will start a project in anticipation of the passing of legislation authorizing flood control, beach erosion, or some other type of project which would normally come from the Public Works Committee. The local community in anticipation of that project being authorized makes expenditures because we are dealing here for the first time in 3 years with a Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act.

We are not acting in good faith, so, consequently we are not keeping up to date, and not being responsive to the needs on this question of what we are supposed to cover, and section 201 is the most beneficial section, as far as I am concerned, and from my observation of these problems in that section of this bill. So I hope those Members who have fears and apprehensions that this is going to become a constitutional question from the executive branch of Government will lose their fears and look with favor upon the legislative act of being responsive.

I again commend the gentleman from California on the great work he has done on this committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because the gentleman now in the well of the House has rendered to this body and to the Committee on Public Works some of the most constructive services I have had the privilege of witnessing in my time of service in this body. Both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, have been practically heroic in the dedication they have given to this committee in the face of very serious illness that both of them suffered earlier this year.

I particularly appreciate the contribution they have made in cosponsoring the section just commented on by the gentleman from Alabama, because I think it is a very constructive step forward. It recognizes the fact we need to expedite the handling of some of these flood problems across the country that have cost us so many millions of dollars in damages this year. It would be tragic if we were to delay approval of this conference report and thereby delay for even a single day the forward movement of the great flood control projects authorized by this report.

I hope that the report of the conferees will be approved by an overwhelming vote, and I congratulate the gentleman from California for the constructive attitude he has taken with reference to it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Alabama for their very gracious comments.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest the regrettable parliamentary situation that we find ourselves in here today, having the Dickey-Lincoln project back in this bill when it was taken out specifically as we all know by a specific vote of the House of 207 to 185 just a few days ago. Time has not changed that situation.

It is also regrettable that the time is controlled completely by the majority. I think the time is long overdue that the rules of this House be reformed so that there will be an absolute right of the minority to have time.

The need for a thorough study of the Dickey-Lincoln project by itself and separate from the combined Passamaquoddy project was established thoroughly during the September 22 debate. In recommending authorization of Dickey-Lincoln, the conference report relies on the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964 and which is a supplement to the 1963 report on the Passamaquoddy project.

I have read that supplemental report with great care and find that far from resolving any discrepancies, it creates new ones. For example, on page 4 of the August 1964 report, the estimated cost of a privately developed steam-generating alternative to Dickey-Lincoln is given as $23.50 per kilowatt-year. In fact, this is about double what it ought to be. In

my State of New Hampshire, Public Service Co. has signed a contract for a 350,000-kilowatt installation at Bow for a cost of $12.34 a kilowatt-year. The figure used by the Government report would have been accurate 10 years ago but costs are coming down, largely because it is cheaper to build large installations such as the project at Bow. Thus, the Government's effort to contrast the public versus private building costs is way off base. This particular figure is a key one to the Government's case but it is wrong and is just one more reason for undertaking a thorough study of the situation before committing the country to this $300 million project.

Another fallacy or erroneous assumption in the report is pointed out in a letter, which is included in the report, from former Secretary of the Treasury Dillon. He notes that the Government has assumed interest charges at the rate of 3⅛ percent per annum when, Mr. Dillon wrote:

In this Department's judgment, the interest rate most appropriate for both cost-benefit analysis and the determination of reimbursement and cost sharing arrangements should reflect the Government's current borrowing costs and, therefore, should be determined on the basis of current market yields on outstanding long-term Treasury obligations. At the present time, the market yield on long-term obligations is close to 4¼ percent.

He finds, also, that:

In view of past experience, that the costs, in particular, may be seriously underestimated.

In sum, if this House approves this project, it will be doing a very careless thing. It would be committing the Government to expenditures of upward of $300 million on a project which is more than 90 percent for electric power production but where there has been no proper analysis of the potential market for power in New England; where there has been no accurate consideration of alternative means for meeting the future power needs of the region; and where there appears to be no sound estimate of the actual costs.

In contrast, it is known that private, taxpaying companies with plans to meet the power needs of New England in the future can produce the same power at no expense to the Government and for a cost of only $71 million.

In my earnest opinion, it would be irresponsible and profligate to abandon the position we took not so many days ago in this House and accede to granting authority for this project without first conducting a thorough study.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because he was unable to obtain time from his own side, I am pleased to yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague [Mr. O'NEILL].

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in all the years that I have been a Member of the Congress I have always been a public power man. I have been one who believes that we need public power when you cannot provide private power. I have been one who, when the people of an area and the Congressmen from an area want public power, I have supported them.

Mr. Speaker, from the New England area there are 25 Congressmen. Twenty of them voted against this project. Why should you try to stick it down our throats? We are not trying to stick anything down your throats in Oklahoma. We are not trying to stick anything down the throats of you who come from Alabama. We are not trying to stick anything down the throats of you Members from Texas. This is a project, and we all realize what it is all about—this will cost $303 million including the transmission lines—that is what it is going to cost—$303 million.

What will you be giving us in this project? You will be giving us a project by which we will be turning back the clock and going back to the days of the horse and buggy and the days of the high button shoes. This is an antiquated hydroelectric powerplant.

How much power is this proposed project going to produce? It will produce less than 1 percent of the power that is used in New England in the present time. As the population of the New England area increases, it is going to be even worse. This is one of the worst projects that I have ever seen in my life. We from New England, 20 out of the 25 Members from New England, have asked you not to give us this project.

Now what happened on this? You went to conference on this bill. What happened in the conference? I have been in public life for 30 years and any time there has been a rollcall vote on the floor of the House that was taken to determine what the will of the Congress was, the conferees went into the conference and upheld the will of the Congress. I can remember when we passed a bill here having to do with stockpiling of certain materials. The bill went to conference. Senator HAYDEN said, "Why the Senate by a rollcall vote voted against this and I will not even bring the matter up." That is what the chairman of our committee and the members of the conference committee should have done.

If you give us this project, you will be selling out 20 Members of the Congress from New England. We do not want this project. We know our area better than you from Alabama and better than you from Oklahoma. We are well on the road of getting cheap electricity in our area. I have heard so many bleeding hearts talk about New England and our problems. Hight power costs have not been the cause of our problems in our area because I think the power in our area is not too much higher than the power out in the Midwest. There are four hundred reasons why industry has left New England—transportation, cheap labor, antiquated buildings, nearness to the market, and all kinds of reasons. But New England, because of its technical knowledge, its universities and colleges, is doing well. There is no cheap power here for Massachusetts. This is a waste of the taxpayers' money. I hope the conference report is defeated.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman from Massachusetts has been saying. Let me also say that the gentleman has pointed out that the House conferees caved in. The conference caved in on this particular project. Why? Simply because the majority of the conferees were in favor of the Dickey-Lincoln project and, no doubt, were delighted and anxious to yield to the other body.

But worse still, Mr. Speaker, and I am not concerned too much about the House conferees yielding on this project—I am more concerned about the fact that we lost the papers and conveniently enough to the Senate. This has not been done—and I do not recall that it has ever been done at any time while I have been a Member of this House of Representatives. This action, of course, makes it impossible for the House to vote on the Dickey-Lincoln project. All that is left to us is to vote the conference report up or down.

I serve on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works. Look at my record. I have voted for public power all over this country. I voted for the great dams of the Northwest and the Southwest. I have voted for flood control and navigation projects all over this country. I have consistently supported the Tennessee Valley Authority. So I am concerned about what we have done here. I think we should rightfully be concerned. Those who support this project should have been satisfied with the study proposed by the action of the House. There has never been a study of Dickey-Lincoln on its own merits. We ought to follow the will of this House and stick by its position for a study and report back to Congress by next March. I have said to those who are interested in this project, if the report is favorable and if it is economically feasible, I will vote for it and I will support it and defend it on this floor. That is exactly what I have been doing with all of the public works projects as provided for in appropriation bills for some 11 years. I intend to keep on doing so. But I do not intend to support this project at this time. Do you know what else happened yesterday?

Do you know what happened yesterday in the supplemental? The Senate has already put in $1,850,000 for this project. The supplemental bill is now being considered on the Senate floor. The bill will be passed in the Senate with the $1,850,000 intact for planning Dickey-Lincoln. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations on Public Works has not even seen the thing, and we will not get a chance to consider it at the rate we are going.

The gentleman from Texas made a great speech, but you can bet your bottom dollar that if we vote down this conference report, there will be another conference. And there ought to be.

Let us make this project stand on its own two feet. Sometime ago I said I would not get in a debate on this matter. but the way this matter has been handled by this committee, or by some of the Members, forces me to take this position.

Mr. Speaker, I have no illusions about the fate of this conference report. There are many, many worthwhile projects in this bill affecting a great number of the Members of the House. I can readily understand their reluctance at this late date—the waning days of this session—to vote against this report and hence, vote against themselves. And this is particularly so in the face of the remarks of the distinguished member of the committee, Mr. WRIGHT, that the some 200-odd Members with projects in the bill will be in the untenable position of losing the whole bill because of the disagreement on only the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. I shall not take 5 minutes.

I hate to be in dispute with other Members from my native State of Massachusetts, and perhaps in dispute with some other members from New England. But I think what they say about the fact that this matter has not been studied and and has not been evaluated by the Corps of Army Engineers and by the other people who are in charge of checking out whether this would be a good project or not happens to be in error. Actually this study, in my memory, started back in 1960. There was a study made under the request, I should say, of our late President Kennedy, who thought that this propject would be a very good one. I think the fact that it is now being confused with the study made about Passamaquoddy must be in error.

I know that no one would do that on purpose. There were separate studies made of the Dickey project and of the Quoddy project. I am sure the Members from Massachusetts and other Members from New England who have spoken must not be speaking for the consumers of public utility power in Massachusetts and rest of New England, because it is clear beyond any doubt that we in New England, especially we in Massachusetts, have the highest rates charged to any consuming public in the United States.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I will yield in a second.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell the House how this bill would help Massachusetts rates any? Your home is 400 miles from where this project is.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will yield to the gentleman when I have time. He knows that what I am saying is correct. I am the first to say that Maine will be the primary beneficiary of this project when it is passed. But also in Massachusetts, including Greater Boston and in the other congressional districts from which other people have testified, it has been demonstrated that during the peak power period time, during the time that power is most used, which is from 4 o'clock in the afternoon to, perhaps, 8 o'clock at night, when this project is completed, the people of Greater Boston will get lower rates for the power that they are now receiving from private utilities.

I have no quarrel with private power. They have done a good job. In fact, they are so bright that it is my understanding they are now buying public power that is generated on the Canadian side of the border.

They are buying public power which is being generated, and selling it to the people of New England at private power rates. It is sold to the people of New England at the rates established by a quasi-judicial group which is very handily controlled from the statehouse in Boston, the Public Utilities Commission. I cannot see any possible reason why anybody from the New England States would object to helping another New England State.

I agree that this project will help primarily Maine. I ask anybody from the State of Massachusetts, what is wrong with helping a neighbor, when we have been consistently voting to help Wyoming, California, Nevada, Hawaii, and all the other States of the United States?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman asked a question. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. We are helping all the States of the United States. What is wrong with helping a neighbor, when the spinoff is going to help the Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield so that I can answer the question?

Mr. MACDONALD. I understand that the people here who are talking against this bill also represent the people who would be benefited by lower rates.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield so that I can answer the question?

Mr. MACDONALD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. I will tell the gentleman why. You cannot point to another project like this, where we have helped other States, that has had such unreliable information that has been developed by the supporters and opposers. Despite what has been said, this project has not been studied on its own. It has been tied into the complex of the much talked about and controversial Passamaquoddy tidal power project. Projects that we voted on for other areas, in the majority of cases have had substantial flood control and navigation benefits. The record clearly shows and the figures prove that there is little flood control and no navigation benefits connected with Dickey-Lincoln School.

You cannot point to another such project that is as costly as this, has had more conflicting and chaotic testimony and that has been studied so little that has been approved, at least in my service here, by the House.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. BOLAND. I am giving you the answer.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield no further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. MACDONALD. I point out to the gentleman that he cannot point out to me another State in the United States which has a higher rate for its public utilities than the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] and I will yield to him.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has declined to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, your conferees bring back to this body today what we consider to be an excellent conference report on the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1965, S. 2300.

What this body has before it today embodies in one form or another the legislation that was reported by the House Committee on Public Works and which passed this body a short time ago. The modifications agreed to by the conferees on the part of the House are ones that the House conferees believe in the long run would be helpful to the individual projects that were affected thereby.

The conferees agreed to the restoration of a most worthy project in its entirety rather than wait for a further study as originally intended by this body when it restored the authorization for the Dickey-Lincoln project on the St. John's River. Minor modifications were made in the overall authorization for flood control improvements on the Lower Mississippi River Basin. A provision relating to use of funds for the establishment of a National Wildlife Refuge on the Waurike project in Oklahoma was deleted by the conferees. A further study of projects already deleted from the bill covering Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is authorized by the conferees.

Several modifications in existing projects such as the San Diego River Basin, the Minnesota River at Mankato, Minn, dealing with reimbursement for local interests for work performed or to be performed were worked out by the conferees. In addition we believe this conference report brings a most satisfactory solution to the problem of the Burns Waterway Harbor project in Indiana while at the same time taking due recognition of the importance of a project for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

There are in addition several minor changes made in the legislation as it passed this body originally. This is a good conference report and one that I trust this body will accept. The disastrous floods and hurricanes of the last year have indicated quite clearly the pressing need for legislation such as that

we are considering today. These projects that are authorized in this legislation will prove their value many times over as has already been shown by those which have been authorized by the Congress, constructed and provided emergency protection in property and human lives through the years.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to reiterate some of the merits of the Dickey project. Although many of these points have been made before when the omnibus rivers and harbors bill was debated in the House a few weeks ago.

History has shown that Federal hydroelectric plants bringing low-cost electricity into an area have stimulated the demand for power from fossil fuel generating plants, this is, plants using coal, oil, or gas, so that the demand for such fuel is enhanced.

The project was thoroughly reviewed by the Federal Power Commission which gave the project a green light only after making the finding that there was no better alternate.

All computations were made in accordance with Senate Document No. 97. Computation for the marketing of the power included load factor, capacity, and energy and repayment within 50 years which included both the cost of the project—$227 million—plus the transmission line—$73 million. All figures were studied and approved by the Federal Power Commission.

The project has the support of the appropriate executive agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Interior, and the Corps of Engineers. Furthermore, the project has the personal endorsement of the President.

Power costs in New England are the highest of any region in the country; there is no public power yardstick in any of the six New England States.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project would be located in an economically depressed area where, for example, 33 percent of the families have incomes of less than $3,000 per year; 48.6 percent of the population is over 65 or under 15 years of age. This is an area where wholesale rates for electric energy average three times what Dickey-Lincoln School rates delivered would be.

Furthermore, and this point is extremely significant, the Dickey-Lincoln School project has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.86 to 1. The huge Colorado River storage project, authorized April 11, 1956, had a ratio of only 1.3 to 1. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project, passed by a voice vote in August 1962, had a ratio of 1.65 to 1.

The 1962 omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill, as passed by voice vote, included 13 multipurpose projects with power. Only three had better benefits-to-cost ratios than Dickey-Lincoln School; 10 had lesser benefits.

In the report now under consideration it is striking to note that of 133 projects for which a benefit cost ratio is given 72 have benefit-cost ratios below 1.86. Fifty-four percent of the projects in this report have benefit-to-cost ratios which are less than the Dickey project. Shall we draw the line at 1.86 and throw out all projects at that line or below thereby eliminating over half the projects in the bill?

In 1953, the New England and New York Interagency Committee took note of the upper St. John River and two possible sites for development were studied—Rankin Rapids and Big Rapids-Lincoln School. They submitted a report in 1955. In 1956 the Corps of Engineers undertook a study of the Passamaquoddy project and looked over several separate sites which would be desirable for development of the upper St. John River as a supplement to the Passamaquoddy project. The two sites chosen for further study were Rankin Rapids and Big Rapids-Lincoln School. There was at that time an engineering analysis of both sites. In 1959, the International Engineering Board filed a report with the International Joint Commission, recommending Rankin Rapids. However, in 1961 at the request of President Kennedy, the department of the Interior undertook a study of the upper St. John, including Big Rapids-Lincoln School and Rankin Rapids, and the alternate to Big Rapids, which was Dickey-Lincoln School was decided on. At that time an independent engineering and economic analysis was made on the Dickey-Lincoln River project which offers more storage and saves the Allagash. The economic benefits and feasibility studies were made separately for Dickey-Lincoln School and Passamaquoddy. These studies were completed in 1963 and submitted to the President. There was a subsequent analysis between 1963 and 1964 and this report was concurred in by the Corps of Engineers and submitted to the Senate Public Works Committee. The final stage came last winter and this spring when the Department of the Interior reevaluated Dickey-Lincoln as a separate project and separated it completely from Passamaquoddy.

It is important to note that even though the studies the Dickey-Lincoln School project was combined with the other projects. The engineering, benefit-cost and power generation studies were always made separately. The last analysis simply took all the background information and refigured the cost and benefits with the new factors involved and came up with the final benefit-cost ratio. Nothing more can be learned by further study.

The Corps of Engineers are satisfied that there has been enough study The Department of the Interior is satified that there has been enough study. The U.S. Senate is satisfied that there has been enough study and President Johnson is satified that there has been enough study.

So much for the merits of the project. The real issue today is whether the managers on the part of the House have worked out with the Senate managers an acceptable compromise. We must realize that compromise plays a paramount role in legislation. Provisions in our Constitution as well as in our most significant laws have come about as the result of compromise. Obviously legislation coming from a legislative branch of government composed of two separate bodies must be the result, in many instances, of a give-and-take process. Neither this body nor the other body can dominate the legislative scene. During this session so far 46 bills have gone through conference and have been approved and signed by the President. Certainly these 46 conference reports were not wholly in accordance with the desire of all the Members of this body nor of the other body but they reflected final judgment of the agents of both Houses working together to bring about a rational settlement of their differences.

Conference is the instrument for final compromise between the House and the Senate, and we should respect the judgment of the conferees. Without such compromise we would not have passed the excise tax cuts, we would not have had the Medicare Act. In that act the conferees had to reach agreement on 513 differences between the House and the Senate versions. Conference reports have been accepted by the House, because we realize that not to accept a rational compromise might mean having no legislation at all.

The same is true with respect to the compromise now before the House. Initially, according to figures obtained from the public works committee staff, the Senate public works bill contained 113 projects. The House bill contained 144 projects which included the 113 of the Senate and in addition the House bill contained the northeastern U.S. water-supply provision and a flood control provision neither of which were contained in the Senate bill. The compromise, the conference report, which contains 142 projects plus the water-supply provision and the flood-control provision shows that managers on the part of the House were able to persuade the representatives from the other body to accept 28 of the 31 projects that were in our bill and not in the Senate bill, to accept title I, the northeastern U.S. water supply provision and to accept the flood control provision in exchange for losing only two projects, two bridge commission extensions and accepting one project, the Dickey-Lincoln School project hydroelectric dam, which had not been rejected by the House but had simply been postponed for future study. So that Senate managers in addition to the water supply and flood control provision accepted 28 projects which the Senate had not even considered and asked us only to accept one project about which we had manifested some hesitancy. Under such conditions, how could we in good conscience reject this entire report and ask for a new conference? We would be saying in effect that we have 90 percent of the hog but we want the whole hog or nothing at all, and I am sure the answer from the other body would be "nothing at all."

The managers on the part of the House should be commended for the excellent compromise they have been able to obtain and we should support them by voting to accept the conference report.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, there has been extended discussion of the Dickey project but since others have held themselves out as experts on power needs, in the State of Maine, I ask your indulgence to again remind the House that this hydroelectric project is desperately needed by my State. There has been a lot of sound and fury but the facts are that our people are paying 20 percent more than the average paid by electricity users throughout the Nation, and as much as 300 percent more than that paid in some areas.

For example, in Augusta, Maine, a family paying $15.70 for a months's electricity would pay $6.10 if living in Clarksville, Tenn., a city of similar size. In Rockland, Maine, a family paying $15.70 for a month's electric power would pay $5.50 if living in Hopkinsville, Ky. A family in Greater Portland paying this same amount of $15.70 would pay $7.46 in Tacoma, Wash.

We cannot expect to get sufficient industries to come to our State to provide jobs for our people with exhorbitantly high power rates.

Maine private power companies have had many years to lower rates in a meaningful way and have offered only promises and token reductions when pressed.

Opponents have argued that thermal power will be cheaper—but the Atomic Energy Commission has stated, and I quote: "The Dickey-Lincoln School project which is being recommended will produce lower cost power than a nuclear alternative."

The Federal Power Commission approves construction of this project, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of the Interior. Certainly the expert advice of these Federal agencies can be relied upon. President Johnson and every New England Governor has endorsed this project—certainly these endorsements were not lightly given.

I think it is appropriate to remind those in the Appalachian region that Maine Representatives supported development of their area.

This project will not mean that less coal will be sold to Maine—none is now being used in Maine for development of electricity. On the contrary, if the project is built, it will increase use of coal through greater industrial growth.

And may I remind my fellow Republicans that if our party is to present itself as the party of all the people, we must show that we care for all the people. Republicans recognize that where private initiative has abjectly failed in a given area, there is nothing wrong in asking for a helping hand from our Federal Government.

And finally to my fellow New Englanders, may I remind them of the countless times Representatives from the State of Maine have cast their votes to help other New England States.

I ask all colleagues today to help us in Maine in our aspirations for a more equal share in the Nation's prosperity.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, a most significant provision in the conference report on the rivers and harbors bill now before this body contains the wherewithal to save one of our Nation's most valuable natural resources, the Chesapeake Bay.

The bill would authorize a thorough study of the entire bay basin, and the construction of a hydraulic model and associated technical center to serve as factual clearinghouse to deal with such problems as pollution, erosion and salinization which currently threaten this overburdened national asset.

Consideration of this legislation is the culmination of many months of research, of proposing, and of prodding since I first suggested the feasibility of this project in the early days of the 88th Congress in 1963. At that time, I became convinced that only by an all-out assault on the environmental factors that jeopardize the Chesapeake Bay could we save this productive waterway.

All along the way, evidence mounted to support my suggestion. First the Corps of Engineers agreed that a complete study of the bay and its tributaries was in order. A visit to the operating model of San Francisco at Sausolito, Calif., confirmed the view that such a scale reproduction would offer new and valuable insights into bay problems and would save untold millions of dollars in the process.

On February 19, 1965, with all of the information of 2 years of study at my disposal, I met with Gov. J. Millard Tawes of Maryland and with the top officials of the State agencies dealing with Chesapeake Bay matters. Their enthusiasm and support for a Bay study, and construction of a model and technical center were unanimous. The very next day, I met with members of the Maryland and Virginia delegations and submitted legislative drafts embodying the language and basic details of the Chesapeake Bay proposals now contained in the rivers and harbors bill. It has been a long, hard campaign, with new allies and fresh troops joining the fight at every turn. But the battle, while joined, is not yet won. The carefully prepared and widely sponsored legislation before us, dealing with the Chesapeake Bay is, I believe, the last, best hope for this much misused and irreplaceable resource.

Every day, pollution of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries by an industrialized civilization is on the increase. Every day the recreational demands of a multiplying population are on the increase. Every day salinization and other phenomena take their toll of a weakened fishery. Every day acres of beautiful and valuable shoreline disappear beneath the water. Every day the burdens of men and nature increase while the resistance of the Chesapeake Bay declines.

For years, dedicated and able Federal, State, and local agencies have studied and attacked these exploding problems, but their individual and combined efforts have been unable to stem the tide. Now we have the chance to throw the full weight of science and technology into the fray in a last ditch coordinated assault.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and in commendation of the House conferees for maintaining the position of the House so successfully.

The detractors of this report have used every argument that has ever been used against every public works bill ever introduced. If their views had prevailed over the years, then the progress of the Nation would have been fixed at 1860 levels.

There would have been no controlling of the Mississippi River. No Intercoastal Canal and our vast system of inland waterways. No development of the Missouri, no Erie Canal, and the hundreds of other programs that have meant so much to us.

The bill before you now is a continuation of this necessary progress and development of our national water resources.

This bill has received months and even years of study. It has selected those that are most vital to the Nation as a whole and with an eye ever out to insure that only those needed and economically feasible were included.

This bill represents another great milestone in our Nation's growth.

I sincerely urge your enthusiastic support of the bill before you.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I regret most exceedingly that the conferees on the part of the House were forced because of circumstances beyond their control to delete two most meriterious pieces of legislation. Those sections would authorize the Muscantine Bridge Commission in Iowa to construct, maintain and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., and another somewhat similar bill which would revise and reenact previous legislation which had set up the city of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorized said commission to construct, maintain and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.

Both of these measures which were agreed to by the House in S. 2300 as it passed the House had previously been acted upon as separate legislation earlier in the session of Congress, had been reported out unanimously by the Committee on Public Works, and passed this body by a unanimous vote.

Full credit for the action on these two important bridge commissions in Iowa belong to Congressman JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, an outstanding freshman member of the Committee on Public Works and Congressman JOHN C. CULVER, of Iowa. Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER fought hard and vigorously for the enactment of the Muscatine Bridge Commission and his colleague from Iowa, Congressman CULVER, fought equally as well for the Clinton Bridge Commission.

The conferees on the part of the House felt strongly about the merit of these two bills and as a result a firm commitment was received from the Senate conferees; such a statement is included in the statement of managers on the part of the House on S. 2300 to the effect that early in the next session of the Congress the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works

of the Senate would hold hearings on this legislation.

I personally believe most strongly in this legislation and I am certain that in the next session of Congress through the efforts of these two able Congressmen, JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER and JOHN C. CULVER, of Iowa, that the Senate, after full hearings are given to these bills, will approve them in the proper form and they will become the law of the land.

May I close by stating that the work of men such as Congressmen JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER and Congressman JOHN C. CULVER has been most effective in adding to the great record the Congress has compiled this year in the field of needed legislation and, in the case of my colleague, JOHN SCHMIDHAUSER, not only do I know his outstanding work as a Member on the floor of the House but I have seen him at close hand during long and arduous sessions of the Committee on Public Works contributing valiantly and most ably to the discussion of the very heavy workload the committee carried through so successfully this year.

I trust and I am sure that in the end both of these commissions will become law and when they do the tribute belongs to these two fine Members from Iowa.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 139, answered "present" 5, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—221

Abbitt	Cohelan	Ford,
Adair	Conyers	William D.
Adams	Corman	Fraser
Addabbo	Craley	Friedel
Albert	Daniels	Fulton, Pa.
Anderson,	Davis, Ga.	Fulton, Tenn.
Tenn.	Dawson	Gallagher
Annunzio	de la Garza	Garmatz
Ashley	Delaney	Gathings
Baldwin	Denton	Gibbons
Bandstra	Donohue	Gilbert
Barrett	Dow	Gilligan
Beckworth	Dowdy	Gonzalez
Bennett	Downing	Gray
Bingham	Duncan, Oreg.	Green, Oreg.
Blatnik	Dwyer	Green, Pa.
Boggs	Dyal	Greigg
Bonner	Edmondson	Grider
Brademas	Edwards, Calif.	Hagen, Calif.
Bray	Edwards, La.	Halleck
Brooks	Ellsworth	Halpern
Brown, Calif.	Evans, Colo.	Hamilton
Burton, Calif.	Everett	Hanley
Byrne, Pa.	Evins, Tenn.	Hanna
Cabell	Fallon	Hansen, Idaho
Callan	Farbstein	Hansen, Iowa
Cameron	Farnsley	Hansen, Wash.
Carter	Farnum	Hardy
Casey	Fascell	Harris
Celler	Feighan	Harvey, Ind.
Chelf	Fogarty	Hathaway
Clevenger	Foley	Hawkins
Hechler	Mize	Roush
Helstoski	Moeller	Roybal
Herlong	Morris	Ryan
Hicks	Morrison	Satterfield
Horton	Moss	St Germain
Howard	Murphy, Ill.	Scheuer
Hull	Murray	Schisler
Hungate	Natcher	Schmidhauser
Huot	Nix	Scott
Ichord	O'Hara, Ill.	Senner
Jacobs	O'Hara, Mich.	Shipley
Joelson	Olson, Minn.	Shriver
Johnson, Calif.	Ottinger	Sickles
Johnson, Okla.	Passman	Sikes
Johnson, Pa.	Patman	Skubitz
Jones, Ala.	Patten	Slack
Jones, Mo.	Pepper	Smith, Iowa
Karsten	Perkins	Springer
Karth	Philbin	Stafford
Kee	Pickle	Stephens
Kelly	Pool	Stratton
King, Calif.	Powell	Stubblefield
King, Utah	Price	Sweeney
Kluczynski	Pucinski	Teague, Tex.
Krebs	Purcell	Trimble
Long, La.	Randall	Tupper
Long, Md.	Redlin	Tuten
McCarthy	Reid, N.Y.	Udall
McDowell	Resnick	Ullman
McFall	Reuss	Van Deerlin
McGrath	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vanik
McVicker	Rhodes, Pa.	Waggonner
Macdonald	Rivers, Alaska	Weltner
Machen	Roberts	White, Idaho
Mackie	Rodino	White, Tex.
Madden	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Wilson,
Matsunaga	Rogers, Tex.	Charles H.
Meeds	Ronan	Wright
Miller	Roncalio	Yates
Mills	Rooney, N.Y.	Young
Minish	Rosenthal	Zablocki
Mink	Rostenkowski	

NAYS—139

Abernethy	Dole	Mathias
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan, Tenn.	Michel
Andrews,	Erlenborn	Minshall
Glenn	Findley	Monagan
Arends	Fino	Moore
Ashbrook	Fisher	Moorhead
Ashmore	Flood	Morton
Ayres	Ford, Gerald R.	Nedzi
Bates	Fountain	Nelsen
Battin	Gettys	O'Brien
Belcher	Giaimo	O'Neill, Mass.
Betts	Goodell	Pelly
Bland	Grabowski	Pirnie
Bolton	Griffin	Poff
Bow	Griffiths	Quillen
Brock	Gross	Race
Broomfield	Grover	Reid, Ill.
Broyhill, N.C.	Gubser	Reinecke
Broyhill, Va.	Gurney	Rooney, Pa.
Buchanan	Haley	St. Onge
Burke	Hall	Saylor
Burleson	Harvey, Mich.	Schneebeli
Burton, Utah	Hays	Schweiker
Byrnes, Wis.	Henderson	Secrest
Cahill	Hutchinson	Selden
Cederberg	Irwin	Smith, Calif.
Chamberlain	Jarman	Smith, Va.
Clancy	Jennings	Stalbaum
Clark	Jonas	Stanton
Clawson, Del	Kastenmeier	Steed
Cleveland	Keith	Taylor
Collier	King, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	Kornegay	Thomson, Wis.
Conable	Kunkel	Todd
Conte	Laird	Tuck
Cooley	Langen	Vivian
Corbett	Latta	Walker, Miss.
Cramer	Lipscomb	Watson
Cunningham	Love	Watts
Curtin	McClory	Whalley
Curtis	McCulloch	Whitener
Daddario	McDade	Whitten
Dague	McEwen	Widnall
Dent	McMillan	Williams
Derwinski	Mailliard	Wydler
Devine	Marsh	Younger
Dickinson	Martin, Ala.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Holland	Pike	Utt
Murphy, N.Y.	Quie	

NOT VOTING—67

Andrews,	Baring	Carey
George W.	Bell	Clausen,
Andrews,	Berry	Don H.
N. Dak.	Bolling	Culver
Aspinall	Callaway	Davis, Wis.
Diggs	MacGregor	Sisk
Dingell	Mackay	Smith, N.Y.
Dorn	Martin, Mass.	Staggers
Dulski	Martin Nebr.	Sullivan
Edwards, Ala.	Matthews	Talcott
Flynt	May	Tenzer
Frelinghuysen	Morgan	Thomas
Fuqua	Morse	Thompson, N.J.
Hagan, Ga.	Mosher	Thompson, Tex.
Harsha	Multer	Toll
Hébert	O'Konski	Tunney
Holifield	Olsen, Mont.	Vigorito
Hosmer	O'Neal, Ga.	Walker, N. Mex.
Keogh	Poage	Watkins
Kirwan	Reifel	Wilson, Bob
Landrum	Rivers, S.C.	Wolff
Leggett	Robison	Wyatt
Lennon	Roudebush	
Lindsay	Rumsfeld	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Olsen of Montana for, with Mr. Pike against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Quie against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Harsha against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. May.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Aspinall.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Berry.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Morse.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Dulski.

Mr. RACE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN]. If he were present, he would vote yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr.

KIRWAN]. If he were present, he would vote "year." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on S. 2300.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 377 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SHIP MORTGAGE BONDS

Mr. DOWNING, on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1185)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the House amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter retroactively any rights which were the subject matter of litigation pending on the date of enactment of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
W. S. MAILLIARD,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
E. L. BARTLETT,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The last sentence of section 4 of the Senate bill provided that "This section shall not apply to any bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness, mortgage, or assignment if the validity of such bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness, mortgage, or assignment, or the foreclosure, validity, or preferred status of such mortgage, is in litigation on the date of enactment of this Act.".

The House amendment struck from the Senate bill this sentence.

The proposed conference substitute would strike the last sentence of section 4 of the Senate bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter retroactively any rights which were the subject matter of litigation pending on the date of enactment of this Act."

It is the position of the House conferees that this amendment is necessary to make it crystal clear that Congress does not intend to retroactively affect in any way rights in litigation pending on the date of enactment of this act. All conferees agreed that the bill must express the concern of Congress that this legislation not in any way prejudge pending litigation or attempt to influence its ultimate disposition.

The managers on the part of the House believe the proposed conference substitute achieves the objectives of both the Senate and House effectively and equitably.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will advise us as to any changes in the program which may be anticipated.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has advised that he will call up, under unanimous consent, on Friday, S. 1098, to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes.

If the second supplemental appropriation bill comes over from the Senate subsequent to the commencement of special orders, we announce now that we will undertake to send it to conference.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman if there are any other changes in the program for tomorrow which he knows of?

Mr. ALBERT. We have listed for today, as the gentleman knows, a number of bills from the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from Arkansas has advised that it is satisfactory to put those over until tomorrow.

We have another conference report today, so I am quite sure we will put over the Committee on Ways and Means bill until tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at this point let me say I have earlier received permission to file two resolutions from the Committee on Rules by midnight tonight, by direction of that committee, providing travel authority for two committees of the House, one the Committee on Agriculture and the other the Committee on Banking and Currency. I understood I would be permitted to call them up tomorrow if time permitted.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as far as the gentleman from Oklahoma is concerned, I have no knowledge of that, but I am glad to have that information available from the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. Also I may advise that tomorrow we may have a conference report which will be eligible and may be called up from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am advised also that we may have some printing resolutions tomorrow. As far as I know, those are the only immediate changes in the program. May I say also that if the supplemental comes over tonight, as I stated before, we are going to send it to conference even though special orders have already commenced. If it is ready, it will be in order to call it up tomorrow. We would like to dispose of that bill early, because it is very important.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I wonder if it is possible for the leadership on the majority side to make any predictions as to the time when the House might be called upon to consider a sine die resolution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is why we are trying to take extraordinary procedures in the consideration of bills and sending bills to conference. We are hoping we can adjourn very soon, and we will if we dispose of our business.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] was absent when the debate today occurred on the education bill. Had he been here, he would have voted for the higher education bill.

The SPEAKER. You mean the gentleman from New York is stating how another Member would have voted if he had been present?

Mr. GOODELL. At the request of Mr. BELL I am making this statement as to how he would have voted if he had been here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes that statement on his own responsibility?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 318 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1186)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8370) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 12, 26, 30, 37, 38, 42, 45, 47 and 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 31, 34, 41, 43, 53 and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$123,622,500, of which not to exceed $11,418,000 shall remain available until expended for plans, construction, alteration, and improvement of facilities, without regard to limitations contained herein"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$74,299,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "; and not to exceed $400,000 from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, pursuant to Public Law 88–250 to be transferred and merged with this appropriation; $1,600,000 in addition to funds otherwise available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,795,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,671,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,536,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,755,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$76,192,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$103,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$126,278,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$81,933,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,184,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,699,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$365,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That in the event the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund is insufficient to meet indemnity payments and other charges against such Fund, not to exceed $250,000 may be borrowed from the Commodity Credit Corporation under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, but repayment of such amount shall include interest at a rate not less than the cost of money to the Commodity Credit Corporation for a comparable period."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,800,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Public Law 89-298
89th Congress, S. 2300
October 27, 1965

An Act

79 STAT. 1073

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Public works projects. Construction and repair.

TITLE I—NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby recognizes that assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States. This plan may provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of (1) a system of major reservoirs to be located within those river basins of the Northeastern United States which drain into the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into the Atlantic Ocean north of the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into Lake Ontario, and those that drain into the Saint Lawrence River, (2) major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest, and (3) major purification facilities. Such plans shall provide for appropriate financial participation by the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other local interests.

Ante, p. 244.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain those reservoirs, conveyance facilities, and purification facilities, which are recommended in the plan prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and which are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of the plan established in accordance with this section.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single and multiple purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10,000,000. No appropriation shall be made to construct, operate, or maintain any such project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report of such proposed project, including all relevant data and all costs.

Flood Control Act of 1965.

Report to Congress.

(b) Any water resource development project authorized to be constructed by this section shall be subject to the same requirements of local cooperation as it would be if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10,000,000 or more.

49 Stat. 1571.
33 USC 701c.
52 Stat. 1215.
33 USC 701c-1.

SEC. 202. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law, the authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

58 Stat. 887.
33 USC 701-1.

SEC. 203. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

Projects, authorization.

SEC. 204. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

SAINT JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

The projects for flood protection on the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers at Derby and Danbury, Connecticut, are hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

NEW ENGLAND-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

LONG ISLAND SOUND AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

HUDSON RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at Yonkers, Saw Mill River, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 258, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,924,000.

NEW YORK-ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

NEUSE RIVER BASIN

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

79 STAT. 1076

MIDDLE ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

FLINT RIVER BASIN

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

Project modification. 62 Stat. 1176.

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

SOUTH ATLANTIC COASTAL AREA

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

PHILLIPPI CREEK BASIN, FLORIDA

The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

Project modification. 33 USC 702a-702m.

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $181,109,000, except that (1) any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, Floodway shall be acquired as

provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928, (2) the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, (3) the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and (4) the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing, and he shall report results of such review to Congress within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. No appropriation made pursuant to the authorization contained in this paragraph shall be available for any project other than those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress.

45 Stat. 536.
33 USC 702d.

Report to Congress.

The project for the St. Francis River, Missouri and Arkansas, within Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,372,000.

St. Francis River. Project modification.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army in that document shall apply with respect to the Seabrook Lock feature of the project. The estimated cost is $56,235,000.

OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

RED RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

The project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, as authorized in the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1187), is hereby

modified in order to provide for a highway crossing Pat Mayse Reservoir to replace the present FM Highway 1499 across Sanders Creek, at an estimated cost of $310,000. Such crossing shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

GULF OF MEXICO

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,004,000.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

Comprehensive Plan

Modification.
60 Stat. 635.

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 270, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

The project for flood protection at Little Rock, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 55, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $363,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

The project for flood protection on Crutcho Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 47, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,801,000.

Trinidad Dam, Colo. Project modification. 72 Stat. 309.

The project for Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colorado, House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-fourth Congress, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in paragraph 2(a) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 1954, published in said document, local interests shall maintain the channel of Purgatoire River through the city of Trinidad. The conditions set forth in paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of said report shall be applicable to the project.

John Martin Reservoir, Colo. Project modification.

The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

Water rights.

(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit

the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000, except that such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, shall be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the James River and tributaries, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 266, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,083,000.

The project for flood control on the Fishing River and tributaries, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,260,000.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $218,009,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of Linneus Reservoir on Locust Creek, St. Catherine Reservoir on East Yellow Creek, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, nor hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonsburg Reservoir on Grand River; the Secretary of the Army shall conduct a review of such reservoirs, local protection works, and hydroelectric power facilities, at an estimated cost of $75,000, and the funds authorized by this paragraph for project planning are authorized to be used for such review. The Secretary shall submit to Congress, at the earliest practical date, a new feasibility report on such projects based upon such review.

Restriction.

Report to Congress.

The project for flood protection on the Platte River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 262, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,889,000.

The project for flood protection on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297; Public Law 85-500) is hereby modified to waive the requirement that local interests contribute in cash 2.16 per centum of the actual construction cost of all items of work provided by the United States. Sun River, Mont. Project modification.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Hocking River, Ohio, in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,520,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided*, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further*, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further*, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved. Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, W. Va. Power features, restrictions.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000. Prior to initiation of construction the Secretary of the Army shall prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, Analysis of costs, etc.

including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

Ante, p. 213.

RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Roseau River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,550,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

Kaskaskia River, Ill. Project modification. 72 Stat. 310.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000, if local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for Ames Dam and Reservoir, Skunk River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 267, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,893,000.

The projects for flood protection at Marshalltown and Waterloo on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $17,570,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

Des Moines River, Iowa. Project modification.

The project on the Des Moines River for flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, House Document Numbered 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified to eliminate the requirement recommended in paragraph 10(a)(2) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 13, 1943, that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

LITTLE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000, except that the development of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. Ante, p. 213.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

EEL RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

The project for the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir with supplemental channel improvements, Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 259, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000. The estimated cost is $3,442,000.

SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,750,000.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000, except that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse local interests for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The projects for the Lower Grande Ronde and Catherine Creek dams and reservoirs, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, Oregon, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 280, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,440,000. The Chief of Engineers shall construct, operate, and maintain such projects.

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

The project for acquisition of additional lands for waterfowl management at John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 28,

Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $706,000, except that the parcels of land, in Oregon, between the Columbia River and the management area boundary within sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of Township 4 North, Range 25 East, Willamette Meridian, as shown on plate 1 of Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, estimated at 611.02 acres, shall not be part of the management area, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase such additional lands in sections 22, 27, 29, and 30, Township 5 North, Range 26 East, Willamette Meridian, outside the present indicated management area boundary on plate 1, as he determines necessary to replace the lands so excluded.

Scioto River, Ohio. Project modification. 76 Stat. 1188.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. In the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, the Federal Government shall not construct such local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, until said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that (1) it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and (2) that such reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

St. Clair River, Mich., etc. Comprehensive plan.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. Such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

Minnesota River, Minn. Project modification. 72 Stat. 310.

SEC. 207. That the project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minnesota, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-500, 72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work necessitated by extreme high water done by such interests on such project between April 1, 1965, and February 1, 1966, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized.

Flood control surveys. Authorization.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any

survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

Report to Congress.

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coastlines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana (water supply).

Boyer River, Iowa.

Keokuk, Iowa.

Mississippi River, north of Dubuque, Iowa.

Black Hawk Creek, Iowa.

Mount Vernon, Indiana.

Orange Lake Basin, Florida.

Mayfield Creek, Kentucky.

Hatchie River and tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.

Spoon River, Illinois.

Grand (Neosho) River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Verdigris River, Kansas.

Verdigris River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Sanderson, Texas.

Abbeville, South Carolina.

All streams which drain directly to Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, California.

Big Mineral Creek, Texas, particularly with reference to construction of a highway bridge.

Irondequoit Creek, New York, and tributaries, including Allens Creek, New York.

Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California to determine advisability of protection work against storm and tidal waves.

Yakima River projects, Wash.

SEC. 209. Notwithstanding the first proviso in section 201 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes", approved May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), the authorization in section 204 of such Act of projects for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Washington, shall expire on June 10, 1970, unless local interests shall before such date furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required local cooperation in such project will be furnished.

33 USC 701c note.

Hill County, Tex. Roads.

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of their contract numbered DA-41-443-eng-[illegible] with Hill County, Texas, which are subject to flooding; such roads being a part of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, at an estimated cost of $130,000.

58 Stat. 899.

Tenn. Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc. Conveyance.

SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, subject to the provisions of this section, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the tract of land lying above elevation 454 feet mean sea level now occupied by such Society at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under a lease executed by the Secretary of the Army and dated February 10, 1958.

(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be made upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and upon such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States. In determining the fair market value of the property, the Secretary shall exclude the value of any improvements made by or at the expense of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(c) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized by this section shall be borne by the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

Restriction.

(d) Title to the property authorized to be conveyed by this section shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

R. D. Bailey Reservoir, W.Va. Designation.

SEC. 212. The authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, West Virginia, hereafter shall be known and designated as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which the authorized Justice Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

Calispell Creek project, Wash. Cost contribution.

SEC. 213. In recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Washington, by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such project and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by him approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of

flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army. Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the project for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890). Unless construction of the project is undertaken within three years from the date of enactment of this section, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

33 USC 709.

New York. Water utilization, etc. Comprehensive plan.

SEC. 214. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with the State of New York, political subdivisions thereof, and appropriate agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins within the State of New York, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate participation by the Department of the Army in carrying out such plans.

Reports to Congress.

SEC. 215. The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities at reservoir areas", approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509), is hereby amended by striking out "before November 1, 1956,".

16 USC 460d-1.

San Francisco Bay, Calif. Water quality control, study.

SEC. 216. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, an investigation and study of San Francisco Bay, California, including San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto, with a view toward determining the feasibility of, and extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes.

Rivers and harbors projects, etc. Local cooperation requirements.

SEC. 217. (a) In the prosecution of projects for rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such projects are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of such projects within such areas.

Ante, p. 552.

Appropriation.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

Eel River, Calif. Protective work costs, reimbursement.

SEC. 218. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to such banks

by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $3,000,000.

SEC. 219. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to accept orders from other Federal departments and agencies for work or services and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

SEC. 220. Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500,000". Information compilation. 74 Stat. 500.

SEC. 221. The Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Designation.

SEC. 222. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965". Citation of title.

TITLE III—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 301. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full. River and Harbor Act of 1965. 59 Stat. 10.

NAVIGATION

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000; Massachusetts.

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000; Rhode Island.

Rondout Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,000; New York and New Jersey.

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 274, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,090,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000; Maryland.

Washington Metropolitan Area.
Potomac and Anacostia Rivers—Removal of Drift in the Washington Metropolitan Area: House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Virginia.
Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

North Carolina.
Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

Georgia.
Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Documents Numbered 226 and 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,569,000. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, shall include facilities to mitigate damages to presently improved areas southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of $40,000. The Chief of Engineers may include additional facilities to mitigate damages additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge if he determines them to be necessary and justified, at an estimated additional cost of $60,000. All such facilities to mitigate damages shall be maintained by local interests.

Florida.
Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Alabama.
Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Louisiana.
Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Michigan.
Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 1[illegible] Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000. In order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $570,000, except that the modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, contained in letter of April 5, 1965, from the Department of the Army to the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, shall apply with respect to recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

Ohio.
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 269, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,840,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000; Ohio.

The project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 480) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct such bank stabilization works at cut numbered 1 as may be necessary in his discretion to keep the navigation channel in its proper alinement at an estimated additional cost of $1,600,000. Local interests shall contribute to the cost of the project an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of this project that would have been required for cut numbered 1, but for this modification. Lorain Harbor. Modification of project.

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000; Indiana.

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. The Secretary of the Army may reimburse the State of Indiana for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Unless construction of the project is initiated within three years from the date of enactment of this Act, the authority to reimburse the State of Indiana contained in this paragraph shall expire. The State of Indiana shall furnish assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the Harbor. No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress during the same Congress. Burns Waterway Harbor. State reimbursement.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000; Texas.

Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas: House Document Numbered 257, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $470,000;

Trinity River and tributaries, Texas: House Document Numbered 276, Eighty-ninth Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and there is hereby authorized $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project. Prior to expenditure of any funds for construction of those features designed exclusively for navigation, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress a reevaluation based upon current criteria. Trinity River and tributaries. Reevaluation report to Congress.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000. The works for wavewash protection within the limits of the modified San Joaquin River navigation project shall be repaired or restored by the United States as determined to be necessary by the Secretary of the Army over the life of the project. California.

Crescent City Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 264, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,980,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, Calif.

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests on such project after August 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Oregon.

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

Washington.

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Hawaii.

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Hou Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated c of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

BEACH EROSION

Rhode Island.

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

New Jersey.

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

South Carolina.

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Florida.

Duval County, Florida: House Document Numbered 273, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,266,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Illinois.

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Hawaii.

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 10 Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,000;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

Aquatic plant control project. 33 USC 610.

SEC. 302. Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian water milfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army,

in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds." Appropriation.

SEC. 303. The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania. Susquehanna River dam, Pa. Construction authorized. 30 Stat. 1151.

SEC. 304. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950: Surveys, authorization. 64 Stat. 168.

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Popponesset Bay, Massachusetts.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study. Contents of reports.

Lake Dauterive and Chareton Floodgate, Louisiana.

Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

Manchester Harbor, Washington.

Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.

Calumet River, Illinois.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, from about mile 29 West of Harvey Lock to U.S. Highway No. 90 in vicinity of Boutte, Louisiana.

Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Withlacoochee River, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the project, with particular reference to provision for a side channel or connecting channel improvement through Cross Bayou

to Old Tampa Bay, in the vicinity of Howard Frankland Bridge, for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

San Francisco County, California (beach erosion).

Lake Michigan Shoreline, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin (beach erosion).

Indian River County, Florida (beach erosion).

Marquette County, Michigan (comprehensive).

SEC. 305. The first proviso in the paragraph which begins "James River, Virginia:" in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874) is amended by striking out "after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date".

76 Stat. 1174.

SEC. 306. Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1174) is amended by striking out "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$22,000".

22 USC 275a.

East River, N.Y., nonnavigable.

SEC. 307. That portion of the East River, in New York County, State of New York, lying between the south line of East Seventeenth Street, extended eastwardly, the United States pierhead line as existed on July 1, 1965, and the south line of East Thirtieth Street, extended eastwardly, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

River Raisin, Mich., nonnavigable.

SEC. 308. The old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Michigan, lying between the Monroe Harbor range front light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, is declared to be not a navigable stream of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given for the filling in of the old channel by the riparian owners on such channel.

Remedial works.
33 USC 633.

SEC. 309. Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 303) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (1) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of July 3, 1958, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested

in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States."

SEC. 310. (a) (1) Subsection (a) of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended by striking out "$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000". 74 Stat. 486.

(2) Subsection (b) of such section 107 is amended by striking out "$200,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(b) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended (1) by striking out "$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000", and (2) by striking out "$400,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000". 76 Stat. 1178.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any project under contract for construction on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 311. The project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is modified in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers, at his discretion, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost (1) such protection for the Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway bridge over the Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet, (2) such temporary protection for the center pier and the south abutment of the New York, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad bridge (Nickel Plate) as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south bridge draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet prior to its replacement, and (3) such modification of the channel limits as is necessary to insure full use of each such draw. Calumet Harbor and River, Ill.-Ind. Project modification.

SEC. 312. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including, but not limited to, the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. Such model and center may be utilized, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. The study authorized by this section shall be given priority. Chesapeake Bay Basin. Water utilization study.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $6,000,000 to carry out this section. Appropriation.

SEC. 313. The Secretary of the Army shall transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and related water resources development. The Secretary shall also submit a report explaining the proposed legislation, and making specific reference to each change in or omission of any provision of existing law. Reports to congressional committees.

Reimbursement of States for water resources projects.

Study.

Report to Congress.

SEC. 314. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall make a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, the Federal Government reimbursing States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public entities, for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and other water resources development purposes, to the extent that such expenditures are incurred after the initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for such authorized projects. The Secretary shall report to Congress, not later than January 31, 1967, the results of such study together with his recommendations in connection therewith.

Citation of title.

SEC. 315. Title III of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

Approved October 27, 1965.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 973 (Comm. on Public Works) and No. 1170 (Comm. of Conference).
SENATE REPORT No. 464 (Comm. on Public Works).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 111 (1965):
July 27: Considered and passed Senate.
Sept. 21: Considered in House.
Sept. 22: Considered and passed House, amended.
Oct. 19: Senate agreed to conference report.
Oct. 20: House agreed to conference report.